THE

REFORMED CHURCH REVIEW

NO. 2.—APRIL, 1901.

I.

THE INFLUENCE OF THE NATURAL SCIENCES UPON THE INTELLECTUAL LIFE OF THE AGE.

(SECOND PAPER.)

BY R. C. SCHIEDT, PH.D.

The first paper on this subject largely dealt with formal questions pertaining to the definition of the natural sciences and their relation to the so-called mental sciences which prevailed in classic antiquity as well as during the first half of the past century. I shall now discuss certain fundamental features which characterize the natural sciences to such a degree that they have revolutionized our whole mode of thinking both in method and intensity. We may, at the outset, divide the natural sciences into three groups, viz., Physics, Chemistry and Biology, not for the purpose of circumscribing their specific functions, but in order to derive from them certain general principles which may serve as elevations from which to survey the whole field. Physics and chemistry primarily deal with the lifeless, *i. e.*, which inanimate nature, while biology on the other hand touches life, especially in Zoölogy and Botany, and here again more from the physiological than from the morphological aspect. However, the laws of inanimate nature, as studied in physics and chemistry, also reign in biology, but they are so complicated here, that they cannot be

utilized for methodical inquiry and, therefore, a peculiarly biological system of investigation has come to prevail.

I shall first of all discuss the importance which must be attached to the idea of *the infinitesimal* in modern science. It is true atomistic theories prevailed in classic antiquity, but only as speculations; they lacked that inward bond of proof which rests upon the phenomena of external nature. Newton was the first one who introduced in a truly scientific way the principle of the infinitesimal as the key to the comprehension of large phenomena. He created, cotemporaneously with Leibnitz, a new mathematical discipline, the infinitesimal calculus, so valuable for geometry. It is much easier to work with figures composed of straight lines than with figures composed of curves. In order to calculate a curve we divide it into a given number of parts and connect these by straight lines. The sum of these lines will be the more accurate the smaller the individual divided parts of the curve are. The same is true, only in a higher degree, of the calculation of whole planes, viz., triangles, rectangles, etc., and still more of solid bodies; the smaller the cubes are into which a given body is divided the more minute and accurate will be the resulting calculation of the contents of the whole body. Newton applied this principle both in physics and astronomy. He proved that the same force which sustains the planets in their course also controls the fall of bodies. Newton showed that all bodies are attracted by the earth and that this attraction is a special case of the universal quality of matter. He not only stated the fact but also explained the law of gravitation. "Masses attract each other in the inverse ratio of the squares of their distances, but in the direct ratio of their masses." When he speaks of distance he refers, of course, in very large bodies to only two points, and for every two points the distance varies. Infinitesimal calculus again solves the question by finding the sum total of the distances between all the possible two points and then deducts from it the total effect of the two large bodies upon each other. Such is the method of the astronomer and physicist in searching for the common bond of a multitude of phenomena and in gaining a real insight into

this multitude. He goes back to the effect of smallest particles in the sense of the infinitesimal calculus, *i. e.*, to elementary effects. This method applies to the theories of heat, of electricity, of light; here, too, the laws of phenomena are established for infinitesimal parts, and from them the explanation of visible phenomena is derived.

It was practically a similar idea upon which a hundred years later modern chemistry was established. Every one is familiar with the fundamental principles of chemical science; when, *e. g.* sulphur and iron are mixed in definite weight proportions and then heated a new substance is obtained, the properties of which are entirely different from those of its component element. Even the most careful microscopic examination fails to detect any traces of either sulphur or iron. A similar phenomenon is observed in the decomposition of acidulated water by the electric current; the resulting elments hydrogen and oxygen have nothing whatsoever in common with water; when these gases are carefully collected and measured they always represent two volumes of hydrogen and one volume of oxgyen, while their weight proportion is approximately that of one to eight. The first example illustrates the process of *synthesis*, the second that of *analysis*; both are opposite operations.

These facts have led to the atomistic theory of matter, according to which matter is not infinitely divisible, not even in the sense of the infinitesimal calculus; on the contrary it has its ultimate limit in the atom, *i. e.*, in the indivisible. The actual size of an atom, however, cannot be observed by the senses, no matter how powerful a microscope may be used. The variation of visible matter is due to the fact that the atoms of different simple elements combine to form the molecules of complex compounds. All visible matter is composed of such molecules. Every molecule of sulphide of iron contains an atom of iron and an atom of sulphur, and every molecule of water two atoms of hydrogen and one atom of oxygen, and just as atoms have to be thought of as separate in space, so likewise molecules. This conception may be taken as literal or merely symbolical; the latter view comes more and more to prevail.

How important the infinitesimal has become in biology is a matter of universal experience. The study of the cell has revolutionized the whole sphere of medicine, and modern bacteriology has changed our entire mode of living. Compared with the atoms of the chemist these smallest elements are large; they lie within the limits of microscopic vision, especially since the wonderful discovery of certain color-stains. A large number of these vegetable tormentors of the human race are now successfully controlled by the master hand of the scientist. The fearful ravages of the so-called germ diseases would certainly have baffled the progress of the human race, if man had not thrown his searchlight beyond the boundary of vision into the realm of the invisible.

The principle of comparison thus applied to the three important branches of the natural sciences shows us on the one hand a broad difference between the mathematico-physical and the chemico-biological factors, on the other hand, however, a close relation between the two; while the one presupposes the infinitesimal and unlimited divisibility the other is limited by the molecule, the cell, the bacterium, and yet both follow similar paths of investigation in certain other definite directions; the principle of energy in physics elaborated by the law of the *conservation of energy*, points to the same processes of thought known in biology by the name of *embryological development*. Both are investigations of the complex simultaneously introduced into science about fifty years ago; both created a tremendous stir in the world of thought. They lead us from the consideration of the minute to that of *magnitudes*.

The law of the conservation of energy is made the universal topic of modern popular scientific lectures. Its applications are startling and dazzling at the same time. The transformation of heat into labor and *vice versa* can be very clearly exhibited through the steam engine, especially when connected with a set of electrical apparatus, for heat turned into electricity is almost entirely consumed either in the form of electricity, or of light or sound or magnetism. These facts have, moreover, become matters of everyday experience and need, therefore, no further demonstration,

they do not deal primarily with the infinitesimal but with the gigantic; they have given our age its robust character.

A parallel to this important physical law is furnished by certain complex results obtained in modern biology, indicated in the terms heredity, adaptation, struggle for existence, natural selection. Although the infinitesimal plays an important rôle in some of these phenomena, it is in no case open to scientific demonstration. Their influence upon social science, theology, philosophy and education has likewise been of a gigantic rather than of a minute character. The biological sciences have demonstrated the fact that scientific thinking is capable of mastering the most complicated material; they are of typical value for all complex conditions.

The question now arises, what is the *specific characteristic of scientific thinking*, *i. e.*, of thinking derived from the study of the *natural* sciences in their widest sense? The answer to this question leads us into an inquiry into the *inductive* and *deductive* methods of thought. Induction leads so to speak from the mouth of the river to its source; deduction from the source to the ocean. Deduction bases its conclusions upon an assured foundation, induction is searching for such a foundation. Deduction appeals to the force of logic, assured of the correctness of its premises; induction is constantly looking for objections and corrections on its way to a definite fundamental principle. Deduction is constantly exposed to objection and prejudice, its assurance is timid; induction is free from prejudice, it is not bound by any fundamental principle.

Deduction lies nearer to the human mind than induction. The philosophers of the past very readily established all sorts of assumptions, upon which they built their airy systems. Aristotle speculated upon the fall of bodies; he assumes that the heavier of two stones would fall faster than the lighter in proportion to its weight, while science has established the fact that all bodies fall with equal rapidity. The establishment of fundamental premises is the most difficult problem in science. The nature student constantly tests his steps and findings, distrusting rather than trusting. The old deductive methods are the childhood

disease of humanity, and yet it is hardly a generation ago that this disease has been successfully eradicated, or has humanity suffered from periodic relapses? Perhaps our educational systems are responsible for the chronic state of this disease, for the deductive method is for practical reasons better adapted to the schoolroom, the methods by which results have been obtained can only in rare cases be the teacher's methods; but, even in this respect the natural sciences are preëminently adapted to inductive instruction, for the experimental is the only rational scientific teaching. However, deduction is as necessary as induction, but it is all-important to find the moment where deduction must begin; the search for this moment is an inductive process.

Let us take as an illustration the history which is closely connected with the establishment of the principle of energy to which reference has been made already. This history is all the more important because the law of the conservation of energy was discovered by men who were not primarily physicists. J. R. Mayer was a naval physician, Joule, the owner of a brewery, Helmholtz, a military physician. They added the last inductive link to the long chain prepared by the physicists. J. R. Mayer's first paper "On the Forces of Unorganized Nature," was refused in 1842 by every journal of repute dealing with physics; it was the chemist Liebig who opened the columns of the "Annals of Chemistry" to the unknown physician. But his work naturally escaped in a chemical journal the notice of professional physicists, so that the hour of recognition only came when Mayer was heart-broken and near his death. Helmholtz had the same experience with his article, "On the Conservation of Energy," written in 1847. The authorities said that it was as much of a phantastic speculation as Hegel's nature philosophy. Only the mathematician Jacobi recognized the importance of Helmholtz's discovery and fought for its recognition. And yet this law was after all only the result of a number of well-known previous laws and phenomena. The discovery was at first proclaimed merely as a guide for investigation, but subsequent experimental confirmations elevated the problem to the rank of a natural law, now open to

endless deductions. A similar history is woven around Newton's discovery of the law of gravity, referred to in a former article of this REVIEW. In fact the development of all the natural sciences is a history of such continuous struggles. Take for example the establishment of the periodic system in chemistry by Mendelejeff and Lothar Meyer, or the growth of the theory of evolution, or—to mention something more familar—the discovery of the true nature and property of light; they not only illustrate the growth of the inductive method, but they also may serve to define the various elementary steps which are involved in inductive and deductive thinking, viz: premise and conclusion, law and hypothesis, analogy and language. Two hundred years ago, Newton propounded his theory of emanation, according to which light motion was due to the fact that certain minute particles were thrown out from the light-giving body with the same rapidity as light itself. But the Dutch physicist, Huygens, published at the same time a different idea of the nature of light, viz: that of wave motion, according to which light waves proceed in all directions from the light-giving body just as sound waves from a ringing bells. But, sound extends beyond solid obstacles; there is no such a thing as sound-shade. It was necessary to make further observations on the wave-lengths of both light and sound. Newton's and Huygen's inductions found an equal number of followers in opposite camps, until further experimental inductions demonstrated that both the differentiations of sound and those of light depended upon the number of vibrations, *e. g.*, blue light being the result of a greater number of vibrations per second than red light. This experimental induction gave Huygens the victory. The next step in the investigation of light was the inquiry into the nature of the vibrations; were they elastic or electric vibrations? Again experiment and not theory had to decide. The two theories reigned supreme for awhile until the facts decided in favor of the electric theory. Thus for two hundred years inductive and deductive method alternately paved the way towards a more perfect knowledge of light, and the end is not yet.

But is absolute induction possible? Is not all science based upon premises, just as mathematics upon axioms? We have said before that the premises of the natural sciences, are *law* on the one hand and *hypothesis* on the other. The former has been illustrated by reference to the principle of energy and Newton's law of gravity, the latter by Huygens' wave theory. In the first paper the difference between law and commandment has been explained. A law is more than a rule; no rule without exceptions, *i. e.*, a rule expresses that which occurs in a majority of cases. The reason why a rule may have exceptions rests upon the fact that a rule is capable of a still more general interpretation. This universal interpretation is the expression of a natural law; it contains concepts which embrace a large class of phenomena. The law of the conservation of energy has no exceptions, its concept is that of energy; it was gradually reached through rules, comprising more special phenomena which allowed exceptions, viz: the theories of the conservation of vital force, and of that of heat-matter. A rule does not yet comprehend nature; it is too narrow, *i. e.*, incapable of universal application. But law and rule are inductively or intuitively established, we might say inductively presupposed. Both are introduced by experimental premises which are then applied deductively and again tested by experiment, until finally the natural law is firmly established. This process is not a matter of days and weeks but of generations and centuries; it implies the gradual ripening of a fruit such as no other science can produce as far as definiteness and perfection is concerned.

What *natural laws* have done for the development of our concepts, *hypotheses* have accomplished for the development of our ideas and views. Hypotheses, therefore, are views by means of which we try to overcome the inaccuracy of our sense-perceptions. In this sense are Newton's emanation theory, Huygens' wave theory and Dalton's atomic theory hypotheses. As soon as such theories can be demonstrated to the senses they cease to be hypotheses and become facts. When Wiener photographed light waves upon thin gelatin plates the wave theory became a

fact. The same is true of the quondam theory of bacteriology. But hypotheses have only value when they embrace larger groups of phenomena; this is not the business of the amateur but of mature genius. It is preëminently the business of the natural sciences to present facts in all their purity and simplicity; however, but few men are capable of distinguishing facts from individual views or ideas.

There is no science which so clearly demonstrates the relation between facts and ideas as the natural science, but facts can only be approximately the perfect expression of ideas, because facts must first stand the test of ages before they can be acknowledged as such or before ideas can be derived from them. Moreover, the very language by means of which ideas are communicated and facts described, varies with the age, so that it is necessary to make use of the *principle of comparison* and its *terminology, i. e. of analogy* and *of language*. In classic antiquity scientific phenomena were described in terms of everyday human experience; modern science on the other hand has transformed human experience and, therefore, imposed its terminology upon human relations. It is only within the last two hundred years that phenomena of fundamental importance have been recognized, and become available as a comparative basis of less known spheres, and even during this period many monstrous expressions played havoc with facts and ideas. Take for instance the terms matter and force in their relation to the philosophical thought of over fifty years ago. The whole materialistic philosophy was based upon these two words. The atoms and their interacting forces constituted the image of the universe. From pure veneration for these terms one matter after another was created; heat matter, light matter, electric matter and magnetic matter, each was supposed to possess its own particular force. With such terminology the world of phenomena was to be explained. The law of the conservation of energy no longer knows these terms, but they are of historic value inasmuch as they warn against the premature acceptance of hypothesis as facts.

Of still greater importance for our modern intellectual life are

the *forms of thought* in which induction and deduction have come to be expressed. Nature confronts us everywhere as a composite and it is the province of natural science to show the relation of the component phenomena to the whole structure. This condition necessitates the ability to analyze complex phenomena as well as to compose individual phenomena, *i. e.*, the ability to *isolate* and to *superpose*. If I say all bodies are heavy, I concentrate the attention upon one property of bodies and exclude all others, such as color, dimension, hardness, etc. The specific gravity of the body is in this case the center of isolation. The term superposition, taken from physics, implies, that when, *e. g.*, different forces act upon a certain body, the individual effects unite into one common effect. The practice of these two principles in the laboratory will enable the student in all spheres of knowledge and of life to master and to organize complicated material as well as conditions and to transmit them in perfect order to others. Classic antiquity knew nothing of the principles, its relation to nature was of an æsthetic character which despised all analysis, because it destroyed all harmony and violated the æsthetic sense.

But if we admit that the phenomena about us are of a composite nature, where are the simple phenomena to which we refer the complex phenomena? Classic antiquity answered, the phenomena of life are the simplest. Plato asks, why does a stone cease in its motion, and his answer is, because it is tired. Another common question was: Which is the most perfect motion? and the answer: Motion in a circle, as illustrated by the apparent daily motion of the starry heavens, hence the systems of Ptolemy, of Copernicus and of Tycho de Brahe. We see, on the one hand, that purely æsthetic considerations decided the definition of simple phenomena; on the other hand, it must be conceded that motile phenomena in ordinary everyday life are not simple phenomena at all. If a wagon drawn by horses comes to a sudden standstill the general observer will say, this is a simple phenomenon. But Galileo's law of motion, expressing the principle of inertia, tells us, that the force of the horses is counteracted by the friction of the wheels against the earth, working against the motion of the

wagon which results in a complex phenomenon. Galileo's discovery was a most brilliant as well as most heroic accomplishment considering the views of his age; he maintained that the simplest motion is motion in a straight line with uniformly accelerated velocity. This law represents an important principle of isolation. The same is true of his law of falling bodies, according to which 'the property of a body to fall is equal to the least resistance which suffices to support it," as illustrated by the fall of stones on the one hand and that of pieces of paper on the other. The irregularity which characterizes the fall of the paper leads to an isolation and separate study of the care and finally to the discovery of the resisting medium, the air; a further experiment in a vacuum will confirm the observation, because all the bodies will fall here with equal rapidity. Here practice and theory go hand in hand. It is the province of experimental investigation to isolate phenomena, *i. e.*, to present them in their simplicity while the theoretical investigation has the further mission to trace pure phenomena in their greatest simplicity back to certain laws; after the establishment of such laws a skillful experimentalist will go further and repeat complicated phenomena of the same kind both theoretically and practically. Only he who combines both the theoretical and the practical can successfully interpret the phenomena of nature. For the sake of a theory complications in certain conditions of nature have at times been underestimated and again simple phenomena have been taken for complex conditions; in all such cases a practical knowledge of the conditions was wanting. On the other hand, he who really masters a theory can also successfully apply it, and the old conflict between theory and practice, between school and life has passed away for the true naturalist. The school has been accustomed to simple transmission of results, it has studiously avoided to explain means and ways by which these have been reached; life has constantly to deal with means and ways in order to accomplish anything, and since the road to life leads through the school, men are prone to avoid the discords of life instead of meeting them, and thus to neglect the most educational opportunities of life. Modern science insists that dis-

cords should not be avoided but met and dissolved; such a solution, however, consists in the harmony which ought to reign between doctrine and experience, between theory and practice, between school and life, between thinking and being. All conflict comes from the fact that the various centers of isolation which enter into a complex phenomenon have not been thoroughly worked out and adjusted to the various interests which enter into the phenomenon. Goethe severely criticised Newton's theory of color, simply because the relations between the physical and physiological interests dealing with light were not yet harmonized with the psychological interests, the isolation in either case had not been carried to its extreme possibility and the proper superposition or harmonious blending was out of question. This task was reserved for the genius of Helmholtz. A visit to a concert or an art-gallery fully illustrates the interpretations of the great physicist. Physically considered a concert is the uniform interaction of a set of shorter or longer sound waves, each preserving its definite characteristic; physiologically the monotony of these wave motions is transformed into a charming and refreshing entertainment creating certain psychic responses. We know very little about the translation of the physical phenomena into the physiological and psychic, but what we do know illustrates the principles of isolation and superposition, viz: our ear is to a certain degree capable of analyzing the complex coöperation of musical instruments. These principles, first applied within the sphere of pure nature science, find, therefore, their analogue in the organization of our body as well as of our mind; from this point of view they are of fundamental importance for the comprehension of our whole intellectual life.

But after we have isolated the individual elements of a complex phenomenon, studied them and determined their relation to the whole of which they are a part a new problem arises, viz: the necessity to determine their comparative value, to arrange them according to their *magnitude*. This leads to a series of fundamental concepts which can only be properly defined by natural science. *What is large, what is small*, are questions of

everyday experience, they naturally refer not to *absolute* but to *relative* concepts. We are accustomed to consider an inch or a grain small magnitudes as over against a mile or a ton which represent very large magnitudes. But such definitions are meaningless, the horizon of our ordinary daily experience is too limited to furnish sufficient stimulus for the determination of exact views and concepts of magnitudes. Scientific theory and observation, on the contrary, deals with the almost infinite in both directions; we learn that the wave-lengths of light differ according to color by fractions of a one-thousandth of a millimeter, that a single vibration occurs in a one-billionth of a second, furthermore that light travels 186,000 miles in a second, etc. Such numbers are practically incomprehensible; science, therefore, measures given cases of infinitesimal magnitude by means of wave-lengths, or large magnitudes referring to the planetary system according to the diameter of the earth or the diameter of the ellipse which the earth describes around the sun. Such measurements are not absolutely accurate as they at first glance would seem; there is no absolutely accurate measurement; the degree of accuracy depends upon its relation to the total value of a measurement. If we purchase a yard of cloth we do not generally insist upon absolutely accurate measurement, a fraction of an inch more or less will make no difference. Accuracy in other spheres is judged from the same point of view. If it is correct that the distance between sun and earth can only be measured within a doubtful margin of nine hundred thousand miles, the accuracy of this measurement comes within the fraction of one one-hundredth of the total measurement. The cause for such discrepancy lies in the fact that indirect measurement involves innumerable small angles where every deficiency even in fractions of a second amounts to a difference of thousands of miles. The appreciation for accuracy must be developed in accordance with the relative demands of actual conditions, otherwise it will lose its real value and become a fad for play with figures. A good example which fits the case is furnished by the measurement of the temperature of the earth's interior. So many conditions of

variation in rock density enter into this calculation that Thomson placed the limits of time since which the surface of the earth solidified between twenty and four hundred millions of years. We must primarily distinguish between the perfect and the essential; it is essential that in the process of superposition the various elements of isolation should sustain a definite but comparative relation in regard to their magnitudes; we can never speak of an absolute or perfect relation. Take, for example, the organization of our senses; only phenomena of certain intensive strength enter our consciousness, they are essential for us, but there are many more processes which lie beyond our ability of grasp, they may be brought nearer to us by means of instruments but the separation wall can never be entirely displaced; it can only be moved farther back.

The value which the study of magnitudes in the natural sciences has had for our whole intellectual life lies in the proper and exact definition of the essential and the non-essential; an error in subordinate matters is of but little consequence and it is only the business of the demagogue in public life to attack subordinate errors for the purpose of overthrowing essential truths.

Now, the question may be asked, are there not other disciplines in the intellectual sphere which furnish material for the same fundamental principles so exclusively claimed for the natural sciences? This question might be answered in the affirmative but the natural sciences have this advantage that they furnish a much clearer basis for the formation of concepts than any other science because they are developed from external facts and phenomena, without any immediate relation to our inward state of mind which is so often clouded by prejudice. The natural sciences have, therefore, furnished the terminology as well as the method for other sciences, especially for purposes of instruction, and in this respect over-zealous enthusiasts have carried the application too far. We only need to mention John Stuart Mill and Thomas Buckle who used physical ideas for the explanation of political and economic conditions, a combination which proved rather fruitful for the perfection of Mill's logic, although Mill

was only an amateur in natural science. But Buckle went much farther in his attempt to turn the science of history into a natural science. Historical science has its separate center of isolation, viz: history, and so has natural science, viz: nature; a mixture of the two is unnatural and therefore unscientific. The great merit of Buckle lies in the fact that he introduced the method of (natural) scientific thinking as a justifiable form of thought into the economic sphere; he especially makes use of those forms of thought which have been described as isolation and superposition because they are more adapted to the discovery of errors than the science of logic. The moral feelings as well as the egotism of the masses are in Buckle's interpretation elements of isolation and the mutual effects of the two constitute the principle of superposition. His examples from physics are poorly chosen because he did not master this science sufficiently, but he who is a perfect master will have a most perfect weapon in the natural sciences with which to demonstrate the force of his arguments, for they offer opportunities for quick orientation in all spheres of objective reality, in science and art, in state and church. The logical means of isolation and superposition are not by any means mere mechanical aids, they are, when properly used, to a high degree organic. Every individual organism exhibits elements of isolation, *e. g.*, the senses and the parts of the body considered in the light of their separate functions, but in their effects they cover one another, the superposition of all the functions of the individual organs is essential for the proper conception of the whole organism. By comparison we find the same forms of isolation and superposition in the organism called the state, a comparison known already in the times of Menenius Agrippa. We speak of social physiology and compare the bureaus of administration with the various centers and sub-centers of the nervous system; each department has indeed its own special sphere of activity but for the welfare of the state they must harmoniously superpose each other. If such harmonious coöperation is impossible the elements of isolation must be somewhere wrongly formed and it may be necessary to construct a new center by the fusion of two

hitherto separate centers or one or the other center of isolation must be suppressed. Such suppression sometimes occurs spontaneously in revolutions, but a wise government will always prevent such violences by the timely formation of new centers of isolation. The intellectual development of every normal human life exhibits a similar illustration. A child learns first to isolate certain phenomena and to form its first concepts in learning to speak when it needs the guidance and direction of its elders; in youth the training of the will is cultivated through concentration upon given tasks and problems, *i. e.*, through education, in manhood the stern demand for self-discipline becomes the all-absorbing center of isolation. All three factors, viz: guidance, education and self-discipline, are necessary for a harmonious development of man; wherever one or the other is wanting life is a failure. The majority of men never reach the third stage; they are satisfied with the carefully collected and labelled knowledge of their school years and the result is the constant conflict and friction in human society.

A true and careful study of the natural sciences will give us not only the essential fundamental principles for intellectual efforts but also a proper understanding for all the more serious and stern problems of human experience. It will suffuse all life with a glory of its omniscient and yet all-merciful creator.

II.

THE HOLY SPIRIT AND THE UNITY OF THE CHURCH.

BY REV. A. E. TRUXAL, D.D.

The positive and emphatic announcement of the Lord Jesus Christ to His disciples that He must needs leave them and take His departure to the world of glory filled their hearts with sorrow and their minds with perplexity. For the purpose of setting their minds at rest and of relieving their sorrowful hearts He promised them another Comforter, even the spirit of truth, which is the Holy Ghost. And, furthermore, he declared unto them that it was for their good that He take His departure; for if He go not hence by the way now opening to Him, the Holy Spirit will not come unto them.

This implied at once that the Spirit had a work to do for the disciples which was essential to their salvation. The process of human redemption had to move forward to a higher plane. Christ is now to be glorified in the heavenly world, and His relation to His disciples and their union and fellowship with Him must henceforth partake of a more spiritual character. He will abide in the sphere of glory, but the Holy Spirit will be with them in this life. He shall dwell in Christ the Head, and also in believers, the members, and by His mediation a spiritual communion shall obtain between believers and Christ, and with believers among themselves. In and through the Holy Spirit the glorified Christ will be present with His people, as He has promised, even unto the end of the world.

Among the different functions which the Spirit was to perform was that of guiding the disciples "into all truth," as the common version has it; or "into all the truth," as the revised version renders it; or "into the whole truth," as some other authorities translate it. It is not material to our present purpose which

rendering be accepted as the correct one. The different readings express different shades of meaning, but we do not propose to discuss these in this connection. It is generally understood that the promise of the Spirit's guidance applies to believers of all ages of the Church, and not simply to the disciples of apostolic times. We take it that this position is correct, and that consequently all Christians in every age down to the end of time have the promise of Christ that the Holy Spirit shall guide them into "all the truth."

But why then are we confronted by so great a diversity of views and practices in the household of believers? Divergences set in almost from the very beginning. An almost endless variety of doctrine has entered into the faith and convictions of believers from the earliest days until now. The most pious, earnest and learned Christians have differed, and differ still, with regard to the doctrine on God, creation and providence; the doctrine on Christ, concerning His person and work, His nature, incarnation, teaching and miracles, sufferings and death, resurrection and glorification, His relation to the Church and to the individual believer; the doctrine on the Holy Spirit, concerning His relation to the Father and the Son, His functions and operations in the salvation of mankind; the doctrine on the Church, concerning her constitution and function, her organization, ordinances and ministry; the doctrine on man, concerning his condition, faith, penitence, regeneration, conversion and his manifold duties as a Christian. Diversity of belief and views and practices runs out in all directions, and has become so great and extensive that the contemplation of it is bewildering and confounding, so that we are almost led to despair of the unity of believers. Where is that ONE body of which Christ is the ever-living head? Perhaps, after all, the guiding presence of the Holy Spirit was promised to the immediate followers of Christ only! Perhaps He has been withdrawn from the Church in all ages afterwards! For must we not infer that if He had been with His people to guide them "into all truth," they would not have differed so much from each other with respect to the whole realm of theo-

retical truth and the entire field of practical truth? How can we believe in the presence and guidance of the Holy Ghost, the Comforter, when Christians of all ages, of unquestioned piety and devotion, of purity of motives and sincerity of purpose, of enlightened and educated minds, fail to arrive at anything like an agreement in their apprehension and conceptions of the truth of God?

The facts on which this reasoning is based would seem to justify the conclusions reached. And yet we regard the conclusions as erroneous. The error is committed by not taking into consideration some other facts that have been left out of view. We must never forget that God does as a rule no violence to His own order of things. Ordinarily, at least, God does not accomplish His purposes through miracles. Hence we must not expect miraculous results to be accomplished by the guidance of the Holy Spirit. It is an indubitable fact that the human faculty for apprehending and comprehending the truth varies greatly in keenness and strength among the children of men. There are general forces in the human family that affect every individual. The influence of heredity asserts itself in each person high or low, learned or unlearned. Consequently men are not constituted alike. There are in the first place, racial distinctions. The members of the different races of men differ from each other in the entire cast of their being, and hence it is impossible for them to view the manifestations of truth exactly in the same light. The mind of each one has grown out of the bosom of the racial life to which the person belongs. The whole past history of the race makes its impress upon the individuals and hence they differ from the members of other races in body, soul and spirit. And the Holy Spirit given to believers does not remove these distinctions. It matters not how pious, pure and holy persons may be, these differences in their mental and spiritual constitution still remain.

There are in like manner also national distinctions. It is one of the mysteries of human life that it is modified by national inheritance; each nation seems to have its own peculiar genius which exerts a moulding influence upon the members thereof. Hence

the individuals of different nations of the same general race differ from each other in the entirety of their being. They are not alike physically, mentally, religiously, or morally. They differ from each other in their general outward appearance; and the outward appearance is but the external expression of the inner character and life. The difference in mind, heart and will is equally great. These are the facts as we find them; we may not be able to account for them, but as to their existence there can be no question. And it is not the province of the Holy Spirit to annihilate these national peculiarities which are part of every individual's being.

Then again persons of the same nation have their own individual peculiarities. Each has his own individuality. No two persons are exactly alike. Each has his own peculiar temperament and disposition, and his own qualities and cast of mind. These diversities are essential and permanent and consequently there is no way by which they may be removed. It might be supposed that education and culture would be instrumental in levelling down these distinctions and in bringing individuals together on one common plane; that the more highly civilized and refined a people are the more will they be able to harmonize their feelings, thoughts and actions. Under one view of the case this is true. But on the other hand it is also true that education and culture cause the peculiar characteristics of the individual to become more clearly marked and pronounced. Among the lowest tribes of men the masses are very much alike physically and in every other respect. Their feelings, ideas and conceptions are all cast in the same mould. And the higher they are raised in the scale of civilization by education and culture the more does their individualism become developed. Hence the diversity existing in the constitution of individuals cannot be regarded as the result of defects that may be removed; for the more the character is polished, the more clearly marked do the lines of separation become.

Now then the operations of the Holy Spirit in believers do not overcome, remove or destroy these individual characteristics.

The influence upon mind and heart, thought and feeling of race, nation, environment and individual constitution will remain. Hence it will continue to be the case that men will not agree in their theories, doctrines and opinions with respect to questions of theology, soteriology and sanctification. Oneness of thought and feeling with regard to redemption and salvation is not effected by the Holy Spirit in the hearts of men and women. Is nothing accomplished then by the presence and guidance of the Holy Spirit? Yes, certainly, and a great deal, but we must not look for results where they are not to be found. The Spirit of God does not set aside the present order of things but works in and with it. There is a unity of believers brought about by the operations of the Holy Spirit but it is found to exist in a sphere where it is not generally sought. The attributes of the church as the body of Christ has not yet been fully actualized; the unity no more and no less than the catholicity or holiness. Unity, however, does exist to a certain extent, but it does not hold in sameness of doctrine or form of worship and service. St. Paul writing to the Galatians (5 : 22) says, "the fruit of the spirit is love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance." And to the Ephesians (5 : 9) he says, "the fruit of the spirit is in all goodness, righteousness and truth." These words show to us the results of the spirit's operation. They belong to the religious character of the believer rather than to any apprehension of the objects of faith on his part. The virtues of the Christian soul are the accomplishments of the Holy Spirit in the believer. And the condition of the believer's soul as indicated by these words constitutes the foundation for Christian unity and fellowship. Those who abound in love, joy, peace, longsuffering and the other fruits of the spirit can and do have fellowship with one another and with their common Lord, though they differ widely in their apprehensions of divine truth. The Holy Spirit leads men to believe and trust in God, to worship and obey Him, and to practice the Christian virtues. The Christian life and character produced by faith in the Lord and obedience to His will furnishes the sphere in which

the union of believers takes place. Christian character does not depend on any particular knowledge of the truth or form of worship. This is evident from the fact that good, pure, earnest Christians are found in each of the many different denominations of the Christian church of the present day.

Therefore we conclude that the oneness of the church is found, not in sameness of doctrine, but in the unity of the Christian life and spirit. The division of the church into so many different denominations is much lamented in these latter days, and earnest desires are expressed and prayers offered for church union. Various propositions, and some foolish ones, are submitted from time to time as bases for the outward unification of the church. And to our mind the most foolish of all propositions is the one that asks for the abolition of all creeds and calls for all Christians to unite on the Bible; just as though they did not all have the Bible and make it the foundation of their faith and practices. It is from the Bible that all divergences in doctrine start. But we hold that there can be real unity in the midst of the outward diversity in form. We do not believe denominationalism to be essentially evil. The divisions in the church are not necessarily the result of sin, though some no doubt are. But though you were to make men as pure as the snow from the clouds and as holy as the angels in heaven, they would still not all understand and believe and feel alike. Such a result would require the destruction of all individuality. The root out of which denominationalism grows lies in the essential constitution of humanity itself. Divisive tendencies manifested themselves in the very beginning of the Christian Church. And in the course of time separations and divisions of various kinds came to exist. At no time after the apostolic age was the church outwardly one. And it is not probable that she ever will be one in the sense that there will be but one outward organization and that all will be united in doctrine and religious practice. Men will evermore view the truths of Revelation under different aspects, and different ceremonies and styles of worship will be needed to satisfy their feelings. Those of like mind and feeling will be gathered together into a

body of their own. It is right they should be. And in this way the diversity is created in the church, which is also found everywhere else in the whole world. The diversity is no evil in itself. We believe it to be a necessity. There may be too many divisions. There are too many now. Some have undoubtedly arisen out of the sinfulness of men. But others have grown legitimately out of the peculiar nature of mankind.

We do not believe that the oneness of the disciples for which Jesus prayed is to be actualized through one general organization. The unity of the church can and does exist without that. The present evil of denominationalism consists in the wrong and sinful attitude which the different churches are prone to assume towards each other. When a denomination arrogates everything to itself and claims to be the only true church in the world and prosecutes its work on the basis of this assumption, then it becomes a warring element in the body of Christ. There has been entirely too much of this kind of denominationalism. But there is no necessity for any branch of the church, that has any right to a separate existence, to take such a position. There is no reason for the members of one church to deny to others Christian faith and character and to refuse fellowship with them. Those who do so are guilty of the sin of schism. They are like the hand that would refuse to the foot membership in the bodily organization. All who truly believe in God as He has revealed Himself in Christ Jesus, and who honestly strive to do His will and lead righteous and holy lives, belong to the church of Christ and are brethren one of another, though they do not hold the same doctrines and perform the religious ceremonies in the same outward way. A true believer in the Lord need not care whether others were baptized by sprinkling, pouring or immersion, whether they were immersed backward or forward, once or thrice, whether they hold the Roman, Lutheran, Calvinistic or Zwinglian conception of the Lord's Supper, whether they bear testimony to their religion in one way or another; if they are humble and devout believers in God, faithful in His worship and service, upright and pure in their lives, and fruitful in good works, he can join hands with

them in Christian love and fellowship, provided, of course, his feelings and acts are reciprocated. This is the direction in which the unity of the church is to be sought. And the more this kind of oneness is realized, the more will the disgraceful conflict of the sects also subside and many of the evils of denominationalism cease. And it is probable, too, that if this should come to be the prevailing spirit in the different denominations some of those most nearly alike in thought and feeling would be merged into each other. Yet the leading division could and would still remain. The various demands and efforts put forth during the last several decades in favor of unity in organization have produced but few results, whereas the spirit of religious courtesy and comity, of Christian love and fellowship has grown wonderfully of late and is producing excellent results in the way of unity among believers.

That the members of the different denominations ought to recognize and treat one another as brethren in Christ Jesus is nowhere more keenly felt than in the foreign mission field. Dr. Downie, one of the editors of the *Baptist Missionary Review* published in India, is quoted by the *Missionary Review of the World** as saying: "Comity is not organic union; that may come some day, but I do not expect it before the morning of the first day of the millennium. Comity is no 'fusion;' comity is simply Christian courtesy, and surely that is attainable. The oneness for which Christ prayed is not a loss of personality or identity, but rather a oneness of character."

J. Haywood Horsburgh, of China is quoted in the same article as urging the different societies to say to their missionaries: "Take heed, therefore, in the country to which you are going, to do nothing which shall endanger the oneness of God's people." What he insists upon is that the churches shall maintain their separate organizations and modes of work, but they shall by word and deed hold out before the heathen the fact that they all belong to the one church of Christ. Another man engaged in the foreign field and quoted in the article referred to is Rev. O. H. Gulick, of Hawaii, who says, "In personal appearance and in

* December Number, p. 914.

dress we differ from one another; our coats may be of different hues, but these are little trifles, for at heart we are one, and unless we are specifically told, we cannot tell who is a Methodist, who a Baptist, or who a Congregationalist." It is generally felt that the case in heathen lands demands that Christian brotherhood, love and coöperation be exemplified by the representatives of the different churches. The heathen would take offense at the antagonism between the denominations that was wont to exist in the home lands. They could not understand it and would be repulsed by it. Hence the missionaries feel constrained to receive each other as brethren and to coöperate with one another.

But if such Christian unity is demanded in face of the heathen, why ought it not also be developed and maintained in the home countries? Is the warfare of the sects not an offense to the Lord? Let the different denominations regard themselves as members (hands and feet for example) of the same body of which Christ is the ever-living Head, and let them not interfere with but strengthen and support each other. Or let them consider themselves as the different brigades of the one great army of God of which Christ is the one great Captain. And let the members of the different churches fellowship with one another in love and peace, and then will we have that oneness of the disciples for which Jesus prayed, and which the Holy Spirit is evermore striving to effect.

III.

CHRISTOLOGICAL THINKING.

BY REV. J. I. SWANDER, D.D.

Doubtless many of the readers of this REVIEW, as they enter upon the present new measure of time, acknowledge that it is meet, right and their bounden duty that they should give thanks to God for the lives and labors of those immortal pathfinders who contributed to its pages during the last half of the nineteenth century, and blazed the way for us through the modern wilderness of sentimental abstraction out into the broad and open fields of a better mode of Christian and scientific thought. Upon this plane we now stand, and from this more central point of view we may now survey the knowable regions round about, and sweep a larger field of theology, philosophy and science. They helped to make it possible for us to occupy this commanding position; their giant faith in the invisible God brought out and made more clearly visible the objective realities of the invisible world: Their mental perspicuity and logical acuteness helped forward the solution of problems which had hitherto defied the best efforts of many scholarly men. Indeed time would fail us in any attempt to measure the swelling current and widening circles of their influence in moulding, enlarging and enriching the storehouse of the world's knowledge. Therefore, in the paraphrased language of Tennyson, we might

> "Talk no more of their renown
> But in God's great Cathedral leave them,
> Since heaven bestowed a brighter crown
> Than any wreath that man can weave them."

These men, the majority of whom have entered into their reward, yet speak. Their utterances now, as during their days in the flesh, are not so much in the loud thunders of Jupiter, as in the semi-tones of that still small voice so often found in sweet ac-

cord with the diapason of God's great universe. Their names will continue to sparkle upon some of the brightest pages of Christian literature. Their work will live in the records of the last half century of America's most incisive educational activity. They helped to found and man and manage some of those less pretentious colleges and seminaries of learning whose mode of thinking and manner of apprehending God's revelation of eternal truth has fully entitled them to the proud distinction they have merited among some of the more historic educational institutions of the American continent. With sincere appreciation of their valuable services, we would make a pious pilgrimage to the graves of those departed worthies,

> "We'd deck their tombs with flowers,
> The rarest ever seen,
> And rain our tears in showers
> To keep them fresh and green."

They have entered into rest. We enter into possession of the rich inheritance which they have left to their successors in labor and responsibility. May this valuable possession remain with us until it shall be transmitted by us as an "inheritance undefiled, incorruptible and that fadeth not away." Among the chief elements of worth is the commanding centrality of position which they occupied in their searches and researches after truth—a position, the proper occupancy of which affords us an advantageous survey of the whole field of warranted human investigation—a survey limited only by the limitations that bound the categories of time and space, and the equally embarrassing limitations that circumscribe the narrow circle of our knowledge. And yet a sense of these barriers should not be permitted to drive us into the convulsions of hopeless despondency. Occupying the proper position of legitimate inquiry, everything within the compass of time and space belongs to us as devout students—at least to the extent of the means at hand, and our ability to use those means in our efforts to solve the problems lying within these catagories. In this position of commanding eminence, we propose to make the most of it. No pent-up Utica will be allowed to contract our limited

powers. Consistent courage to the front! Cowards to the rear! We are not disposed to be found among those who draw back to the charnel house of dead traditions; neither do we propose any attempt to spring forward with a radical bound or fly upward in a silly effort to scrape the skies for truths not yet revealed to the children of men. We acknowledge no new sun in the heavens which are of old, but hail with new joy the recent risings of the old luminary. With justifiable courage we shall move forward in the confidence that all growing revelations of truth in the latitudes and longitudes, and attitudes and profunditudes of time and space may be consistently summoned to pass before our growing vision.

Mention has been made of the limitations placed upon our ability to solve some of the problems which seem to challenge our attention. Some of these limitations may be measurably removed. One means of their removal may be found within ourselves and employed among ourselves. Teacher and students keep too far apart. Although they are not identical, they should come more and more to regard each other as reciprocally interdependent. Indeed, they should dwell within the same personal temple and under the same dome of thought. What God has joined together let not man put asunder. The man as a lecturer dare not divorce himself from himself as an auditor. We make proof of the apostolicity of our calling by our diligence as disciples. Only as we continue to delve after the rudiments of knowledge are we able to spread our pinions and soar away into the eminence of successful apostleship. Probably it was Spurgeon who said that when the teacher ceases to be a learner he is ready to be put to bed with a spade. The ideal professor of the twentieth century must be primarily a student and yet no less a teacher.

Why should it be regarded as unwarranted pessimism to gently intimate that much of the hard work now performed in many of our collegiate institutions is little better than the chattering of educated parrots? Professors and students investigate too little for themselves and do too little thinking upon their own responsibility. Individuality must arise and assert and exert itself—not over against solidarity, but in behalf and in exercise

of its own sacred and vested rights. What saith the Scriptures? "Only to him that is joined to all the living is there hope." It is equally true, however, that to him to whom individuality is lost in the general mass of the living there is little hope of his accomplishing very much for himself, for the mass or for the age in which he professes to live. "A living dog is better than a dead lion," and yet there is no reason whatever that a radically conservative and conservatively progressive student of nature, and searcher after the deep things of God, should be cast and classed among the dogs of independence so long as he keeps himself in vital and coöperative relation with the general march of legitimate progress and the central current of the world's historic onflow.

Wherever and as long as this constitutional relation between the individual thinker and the collegiate body is properly understood there will be no danger of elastic independence on the one hand or of scholastic imperialism on the other. Failing to keep this relation properly in mind as the pivotal point on which God balances and regulates the complemental forces and factors of human history, society is constantly liable to lose its equilibrium. This is true not only in the solution of the governmental problems of the age and in the business centers of the world where labor and capital are too often in conflict for the mastery, but in the efforts at the solution of the world's educational problems as well. The equilibrium between the general and the particular is disturbed if not destroyed. The presumption of scholastic imperialism provokes scorbutic independence of thought. The wisdom of a regular college course is called into question, and self-made men rush to the front in the exact image of their respective makers. The malaria of college eclecticism fills the air. Men inhale this atmosphere, expand their self-sufficiency and rush by the shorter way to the ephemeral glory of a superficial smattering of something supposed to be an education. On the other hand other men follow the beaten path of the regular college course, narrow themselves in the narrowness of scholastic ruts and graduate as classical pigmies because the more powerful drift toward scholastic

aggregation is allowed to dwarf the dignity, absorb the energy and ignore the accountability of the individual student. And yet we pity the man who magnifies his individual apprehension of things to the extent that he is found puckering his pouted lips to whistle a discordant note while the grand central orchestra of the rational universe is moving on and making music in sweet accord with the law of history.

While it is clear, according to the records of history, that God elects or selects men from the aggregate mass of humanity, and places them in representative positions on the world's great stage, it is also in evidence, according to the same pages of testimony, that God makes use of individual persons to emancipate and elevate the masses. He made known His ways unto Moses before He displayed His power unto the children of Israel. For more than fifty centuries and through more than a hundred generations the current of human blood had been coursing its way in human veins, and yet it remained for the individual Harvey to discover the fact of such circulation. For thousands of years the masses of men had welcomed the rising of the sun, and yet it remained for the individual Copernicus to explain sunrise in the light of true science. The great men of the world have reached the zenith of their greatness by performing well their respective *parts* in the great drama of human life. True, they were debtors to an objective power resident in society as a whole, of which they were very members incorporate; and yet they succeeded in the solution of their own problems by asserting their own individuality.

Individual thinkers must stand in organic relation with the thinking of the world. If in scholarly humility they bow their ears to the ground and listen to the mighty tread of the world's intellectual battle-march, they will have no desire for individual bush-whacking. They will hear the world of mind saying to their mind: "Without me ye can do nothing." The general mind is in the order of being, before the individual mind. It may be laid down as a general principle of truth and applicable to individual scholarship:—Only that which grows legitimately out of an organism and yet continues *in* and *of* and *for* such or-

ganism can share in the nature and general mission of such organism, as well as in the destiny and glory that await it. Dr. Harbaugh once said: "He who would move the world cannot be both fulcrum and lever." The engineer must move with his engine in order to ride upon it and keep his hand upon the throttle. Only thus can he keep with and ahead of the train and land with the passengers at the grand central station of progressive humanity. Such are some of the conditions of a liberal education and true freedom of thought. No man liveth unto himself, and no man can truly think for himself unless he thinks on a line convergingly parallel with the objective sweep of the world's intellectual empire. This does not exclude the sacred right of individual independence. It rather makes proper independence possible and conducts its activities with conservative safety. The thoughts of Jesus Christ were always in sympathy and in harmony with the stream of the world's thinking except as that stream had been diverged from its channel or dammed to its stagnation by the perverting powers of radical error. Saul of Tarsus was in vital touch with the learning and culture of the old world, both as a Hebrew and as a Roman; and when he became Paul of Damascus he did not break away entirely from his traditions and leave the world behind him. He sought rather to cast out the element of evil therefrom. So much, indeed, was he in sympathy with God's world that he in the fullest and freest exercise of his individuality rushed to its rescue and joined the noble army of martyrs. And when our own Dr. Nevin sought and taught something purer than Puritanism he did it as an individual and in a way consistent with sound tradition, historic progress and eternal truth.

In all sound and successful thinking—thinking that serves to discipline the mind and benefit the world—very much depends upon the *method* of thought. By method we mean the manner of logical investigation. President Mahan was not the only logician of the last century who made distinction between the two methods. It coursed its way like a golden thread through all the thinking, speaking and writing of Dr. J. Wil-

liamson Nevin, and now inspires the most scientific efforts of search and research on the part of his disciples. This distinction is made between the separatistic and the systematic, or the fragmentary and the scientific. The former puts asunder what God has joined together; the latter considers things in their constitutional relations. According to this latter method the facts and constituent parts of creation are marshaled before the reasoning faculty as things which belong to one stupendous whole. This is absolutely necessary to safe progress in the right direction. Because the opposite method is too generally adopted and practiced we are witnessing an age of many sham battles and imaginary victories. We must not overlook the ordained relation of things. We prophesy in part because a large part of the prophet's burden is excluded from our view; and it cannot be otherwise until we so adjust the angle and broaden the scope of our logical vision as to sweep every section of the knowable universe. Such false thinking leads to partialism, the bane of modern philosophy and the bigotry of modern religion; and it will not be wise to look for an early dawn of the millennial day until there is a more general turning away from such partialism to a clearer apprehension of that comprehensive whole which concenters in the alpha and omega of all things.

To think correctly, profoundly and productively the individual thinker must also start aright. His beginning must have its genesis in the reasonable assumption that there is something to think and reason about. Men cannot create premises; they can only arrange them in syllogistic order and draw conclusions therefrom. Descartes was wrong when he took his philosophical point of departure in the shadow of universal doubt. Anselm was right when he taught that faith was necessary to knowledge. If faith conditions knowledge, it also conditions correct thinking and logical reasoning. By faith we know that the worlds were made. Assuming the existence of things, we begin to think about them and then reason about them. Intuition is the point of departure for induction. In logical thought, as in our holy religion, faith is the victory that overcometh the world. The

logician's faith may not be as liberal as St. Paul's idea of charity which believeth *all* things, yet it believes that *all* things exist, and that they began their existence by the word of the preëxistent and eternal God.

The correctness of the position just taken not only justifies but also necessitates the further assumption that there is a preexistent *One*. He is either a logical or an illogical fool who tacitly says in his baseless syllogism that there is no God. How long will such folly be tolerated in the radiant blaze of the twentieth century? The assumption of the existence of the Preexistent is an absolute necessity to true science. Even outside of a special revelation the logical thinker must come to this basic major proposition of all sound thinking. While the fragmentary method of reasoning keeps silence upon this fundamental point in sound logic even the more scientific pebbles of poetry cry out:

> "And verily many thinkers of this age,
> Aye, many Christian teachers, half in heaven,
> Are wrong in just this sense, who understand
> Our natural world too insularly, as if
> No spiritual counterpart completed it,
> Consummating its meaning, rounding all
> To justice and perfection, line by line,
> Form by form, nothing single nor alone,
> The great below clenched by the great above."

Some one, alluding to the author of the above quotation, has said of Mrs. Elizabeth Barrett Browning that she, more than any other English writer in the nineteenth century, combined the strength of the masculine brain with the tenderness of the feminine heart. Very well! May the new century give us more of such masculine femininity and feminine masculinity in the poetry and philosophy of the years to come!

That great One above must be a preëxistent *Person*. If the human mind be unable to grasp the mystery herein involved, it is equally true that human logic has no foundation without assuming or subsuming such a basis. Even science needs an Immanuel, a God with us, a God before us. All logic must become Christological. The spirit that now vapors so generally within

its Christless walls will not sustain it in the hour of need. Even secular science must yet come and bow before the manger cradle and inquire from the conscious depths of its helplessness: "Where is He that is born King of the Jews"? It is even now being challenged: "What think ye of Christ?" To that challenge science must either respond with an appropriate answer, or perish from the earth.

Jesus Christ, as the great teacher sent from God, is thus helpful not only to the best philosophic and scientific thought of the world, but also and rather as the principle and personal embodiment of the truth He teaches. Hence His recognition in such character is (to use a newly coined word) sinequanonimous to the world in the solution of its own problem. Without such recognition all so-called scholarly thought must evaporate, in its last analysis to something a little better than attenuated thoughtlessness. Jesus may be regarded as primarily neither a scientist nor a philosopher and yet only in the light of His person can the most valuable knowledge of the world be reduced to a system; and in His religion there is more divine and sublime philosophy than the world ever dreamed of in all its consecrated traditions of the past and in all its inspired imaginations of the future. In a broad sense Christ is not only the Atlas who carries the sins of the world and the government of the world upon His shoulders, but also the root of David who opens the world's great book, unseals its seven seals and lifts it out of the shadow of an otherwise insolvable riddle.

The idea is nearly exploded in the front rank of progressive scholarship that man can think wisely in fragmentary chunks, reason in separate sections and gather sound knowledge by the process of mechanical accretion. Broad and versatile scholarship is not the product of many heterogeneous ideas. It is the man of one idea who makes his mark in the world and writes his immortality upon the parchment of the skies. That one idea, however, must be pregnant with germinal principle and power, and contain in itself the tap-root of all others. Show us that man with brains in his head and a bugle in his throat and we will show you the

man who will chase a thousand, and one of two who will put ten thousand to flight. Such a man was the apostle to the gentiles. He was determined not to know anything but Jesus Christ and Him crucified and the power of His resurrection. Such a man, counting all other things but loss for the excellency of such knowledge, was not long in being caught up into the third heaven to behold uncurtained scenes and hear unspeakable words.

It does not logically follow from the foregoing that the man whose life is moulded by the one grand world absorbing idea is to become and remain small and narrow in his intellectual attainments and acquirements. Indeed the very opposite is to be expected of such an one. The principle of unification does not contract his powers. It rather involves the possibility of imperial expansion. It will grow in every proper sense of organic accretion. As in the case of the mustard tree, the parabolic emblem of the Kingdom of God itself, it will extend its branches far and wide until its legitimate end is fully attained. What is that end? For the individual it is such a development of his entire being as to enable him to realize the proper idea of humanity in his own person and character. This means both an awakement and an enlargement of himself—a building up and broadening out and diving down of such symmetrical and stalwart scholarship as this age requires to rouse the world from its dreams and roll it back into the field of heavenly vision.

Of course, it goes without saying that such scholarship is best acquired when its commencement is made and its foundation is laid in a regular academic or college course. It is too late in the day to discuss the fact of sunrise and the necessity for sunshine. There is a sense in which scholars are self-made, and yet if they have no maker but themselves the work is no better than its maker. The regular college course having been weighed in the scales of observation and experience has caused the dust of the balance to kick the beam. Educational eclecticism and a superficial smattering of homeopathic knowledge have been found wanting in both quantity and quality. It is minus in quantity for want of opportunity; it is inferior in quality for want of that

discipline which can be found nowhere so well as in the languages, the logic and the mathematics of the classical college course. True, some of the diligent students of nature have risen above the plane of their disadvantages and stamped themselves upon the ages with a beneficial and everlasting impress. Dwight L. Moody, who was not a college man, addressed and probably impressed more millions upon the subject of religion than any other evangelist of the nineteenth century, and yet how much better he might have fought the good fight and finished his course had he been able to read his great message in the original tongue and deliver it in a better system and better method of theological thought.

These then, are a few of the factoral forces included in the conditions, construction and application of rotund Christian scholarship; and they imply the possession of natural ability or receptive capacity as necessary to successful intellectual diligence. Such scholarly symmetry is never attained in a sluggard's dream; and all the looms and flying shuttles in the college world could never weave a silk purse out of the cartaliginous fibers of a sow's ear. Furthermore, the individual possessed of such natural endowments expanded by unremitting diligence, must come to a consciousness of himself as such without suffering from the effects of explosive self-esteem or a false sense of self-importance. Such a catastrophe he may escape by acquainting himself with a fact according to the general law of heredity that he is largely indebted to his grandmother for the superior endowments of his soul. This point of departure will lead the individual by way of reflection to recognize the existence of a maerocosmic realm of being of which he is only an infinitesimally small organic part. He must come to see this organism in its *solidarity* of character. He will—he *must* come to recognize one all-pervasive life principle in the constitution and historic onflow of generic humanity. In such onflow he must also come to see history as the working out of God's great plan of the universe in the use of the free will of man for its accomplishment. This will lead the earnest and the devoutly disposed individual to observe and make a note of

the inseparable yet distinct relation between the *objective* and *subjective*, the two complemental forces that are ever mutually interactive in the unfolding of the world's history and in the solution of the problem of human destiny, the most momentous problem of the universe—the problem whose solution will run through all the progressive thinking of the future and parallel with all the unfolding years of time—the problem which will never be completely solved until the great angel shall stand with one foot on sea and one on land and swear that time shall be no more.

And when the history of the world is written, and the contents of the scroll thereof is unrolled before the everlasting admiration of the spirits of the just made perfect, its most resplendent paragraphs will sparkle with the immortal names, not only of those heroes of gigantic faith who subdued mountains, quenched the violence of fire and put to flight the armies of the aliens ; but also the names of the world's profound, progressive and productive thinkers—thinkers who are not afraid to do a little thinking upon their own responsibility—who take to their own intellectual diving bells and plunge beneath the surface of things into the ocean of God's revealing word and works—men whose thoughts sink their roots into the achievements of the past and stretch their branches out and up into the purer and more invigorating air of that great hereafter which is close at hand.

IV.

THE PURPOSE OF THE BIBLE AND FAITH IN ITS TEACHINGS.

BY J. W. LOVE, D.D.

It is claimed that the Bible is more read and studied to-day than any other book that has ever been published. It is also true that no book has ever been subjected to as severe tests of critics of all classes—friendly and unfriendly. The authorship, genuineness and integrity of each of its sixty-six books have been the study of the brainiest men of every age since they were written. In modern times, especially, there is a multitude of investigators from the "lower" to the "higher" critics, divided up into schools and cliques, for and against this written revelation of God to man. It must be admitted, too, that some of what are called the "destructive" critics are often very scholarly men, whose learning entitles them to a respectful hearing. But it is also true that there is a much larger number, equally as learned, who, after a patient and thorough investigation of all attainable facts, sincerely believe the Bible to be a revelation from God, made by men qualified and divinely inspired to communicate its truth to the race under the curse of sin. If, therefore, it comes to the question of whether we are to believe the friends or enemies of the Bible, or as to whose judgment is worthy of the greater confidence, the weight of authority is undoubtedly on the side of those who accept it as the word of God.

But with the believer in the genuineness and integrity of the Holy Scriptures it is not simply a question of which side of the controversy has the larger number of learned advocates, but also of experience in practically testing the truth taught *by acceptance of and obedience thereto.*

If we admit the existence of a divine sovereign and ruler of the universe, we can easily test the benefits of what purports to

be His will concerning man by living as the Bible teaches we should. Finding by experience that it brings peace and joy of heart to obey divine commands; that it promotes the comfort of the home and the welfare of society to live by this rule of practice will go very far towards confirming believers in the truth of what they have already accepted as true.

It may be said that it is begging the question to ask any one first to *believe*, and then act upon such belief in order that he may *know* of its truth. We reply that all knowledge must begin in belief. The old Latin fathers were undoubtedly right in saying: *Credo ut intelligam.* Froude but gives expression to a universal experience when he says: "The practical effect of a belief is the real test of its soundness."

It is true, however, that at best we can only know in part, even in the secular material world, and, of course, the same is true in the religious and spiritual realm. Our limitation, in things infinite and eternal, is a finite mind. It is impossible for us to compass the infinite. But, as has been so often said, "that which is above the finite is not necessarily contrary thereto." The infinite and eternal verities of divine revelation are never contrary to human reason, and may well be accepted by it, especially when, apprehended by the truth, we are lifted out of the lower, natural order of sin-fallen life to the higher planes of real, enjoyable spiritual life. To such an one *the chief purpose of the Bible is to reveal the will of God concerning man's redemption from the guilt and consequences of sin.*

Of course, in this article, we take for granted that man is a sinner. Whether he became a sinner by the actual fall and disobedience of his generic, natural head in Eden, or in some other way, we are not here called upon to discuss. But that the scriptures clearly teach natural depravity, seems very plain. Few will deny, however, that all men are sinners against the law of God—naturally and practically rebels against divine authority. Observation and experience, as well as scripture, teach this. It must logically follow therefore, that all men are under the condemnation of a violated divine law, and subject to its penalty.

How shall we get rid of a guilty conscience, and escape the penalty of our disobedience? The purpose of the Bible is to tell us.

Still further: We must take for granted that only believers can *appreciate and understand* God's wonderful love in the gift of His Son to save from the guilt and penalty of sin. If a man does not believe the Bible to be a revelation from God, he cannot, of course, see any purpose in it. It will appear to him only as a fraud, or, at best, as an enigma. He cannot be expected to understand its meaning. In this article we do not, therefore, write for that class. We aim only to suggest to *believers* what the purpose of *God's* revelation in the scriptures is *for them.* Neither do we make any attempt to answer criticism, or give reasons why we believe in the genuineness and integrity of the Bible. All that is assumed to be true, and accepted by those for whom we write. It is simply our desire to call attention to the fact, that *the great and main purpose of the Bible is to reveal to man, conscious of sin and guilt, that his Creator and Sovereign has planned for his redemption from the guilt and penalty of sin.* That is to say: it is the purpose of the Bible to give promise of a Saviour, and the assurance that this promise has its fulfillment in Jesus of Nazareth, the Son of Mary and the Son of God. Of course, as believers, we accept the truth that this promise was already made in Eden, immediately after the fall and disobedience of our first parents; that they and their posterity might not be given over to eternal despair, but have hope in God to deliver them and theirs from the misery and death of their sin. If any one doubts whether the history of the fall is *actual* history; if he imagines that it is only fable, or a picture, to account for the universal sense of sin and its misery—as even some teachers of the Bible are willing to concede—he must admit that it was put in the book of Genesis to teach *something of importance to know.* Yea it is only to sinners under penalty of death that a Saviour can be offered—none others would need Him. To believers in the Bible as a whole, it must be evident, that a Saviour, answering to man's need, was promised very early in the history of the race. Whatever fanciful theory may be

held, by the few, of the fall of Adam and Eve; whatever definition may be given to the depravity of human nature, the one fact remains; viz: that God promised Adam already to give him and his a deliverer from sin and its consequences. Those who raise questions and discuss them, regarding the statements of the Bible of minor importance seem to us to be only raising a dust by which they would obscure fundamental truth.

Suppose the fall, and the statements as to how it was brought about is "a myth"—suppose it comes down from prehistoric times, and was only put in the Bible to make a plausible story, to account for man's inclination to sin; how does that affect the great truth, running all through the Old Testament, that a Messiah will come in due time to redeem His people Isreal, and offer salvation to the race of sin-fallen humanity? Why shall the rubbish, created by ingenious theories to destroy belief in things of no importance, cover up, or obscure truth that is of fundamental importance? It would seem that some, who imagine themselves "wise above what is written," take no little pride in parading so-called incongruities and errors, rather than in accepting and holding up great truth essential to our salvation from sin and death. However such effort may injuriously affect a few unstable minds of young people, whether in our theological seminaries, in the ministry, or in the membership of the church, the one great theme of the Bible from the beginning of Genesis to the end of Revelation, is Christ promised and Christ come, a Saviour just suited to the needs of a perishing world of sinners.

It will not be denied by any who believe in Christianity, as a world-saving religion, that faith in the Author of Christianity is essential to salvation, and of vital importance to the world. Christ's preëxistence, atonement for sin, victory over death, and exaltation at the right hand of the Father, whence He mediates the blessings of a full salvation to men, is taught in all creeds of the Orthodox Church Catholic, and held by its membership. But there are not a few who boast of being "up-to-date" Christians, and who repeat the creeds regularly, who yet fail to appreciate and appropriate their vital truth. They are so occupied

with investigation of who wrote the Pentateuch; whether Isaiah is the real author of the book attributed to him; whether the whale really did swallow Jonah, etc., that they have no time for the deeper and essential things of religion. Some of these "advanced thinkers"—good Christian men, of course—are considerably unsettled in their convictions, even as to the books of the New Testament. For example: they are not sure the Gospel of John is authentic, and that it was not written in the latter part of the second, or early part of the third century. It may be all right for theological professors of learning and ability to investigate all questions relating to the genuineness and integrity of the Scriptures. That is a part of their special business, and we must depend on them for results, after they are well ascertained. We would not, on any account, deny them the fullest freedom in this regard, or put a muzzle upon their mouths when they are certain that they have discovered some new truth, even though it upset long-cherished beliefs. But is there not too much of this thing for profit (unless it be in the sale of their books) to the Ministry and to the Church? Many views and mere opinions of men are promulgated for truth with very slight foundation upon which to rest. Sometimes even the most absurd theories are advanced, by men high up in scholarship and in their profession, based solely upon a distorted imagination.

Are we smaller men, whose calling and duty it is to preach the great verities of the Bible, to be turned aside in our thinking and teaching from the divine purpose God had in giving us the Bible? Is it in any sense profitable for the active ministry to give much of their thought and time to questions that have little to do with the Salvation of the souls entrusted to their care, or of souls perishing in sin? It may be interesting and suggestive to read what the "higher" and "lower" critics have to say about the Bible, but we need to be careful how we allow them to influence our thinking and teaching, if their views obscure, or minify the great truth of our holy religion as it has been held and taught by the church in the ages gone by.

A consensus of theological belief ought always to have more

weight than individual opinions, at least until such consensus of belief has *actually* been proven to be erroneous.

Of new dogma, and supposed new historical discoveries, affecting to a greater or less extent, the precious things of religion, there is no end. That any man who can make a plausible argument for or against truth can get a following, we all know. When men want to believe a thing, as a rule, they can easily persuade themselves to do so, no matter how contrary to the truth it may be. Life is too short, time is too precious for the average minister to spend very much of it investigating that which is new, and in conflict with what the great minds of the past have accepted as true, in the centuries gone by. At any rate, there is enough of substantial, fundamental truth in the Bible to keep us thinking and teaching for the ages to come—truth that clusters around the one great theme of the Bible—the person and work of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

Critics "high" and "low" may come and go, but the record of divine revelation promising a deliverer from sin, and His coming in the flesh, with all that He is, has done, and is doing for the salvation of the race, will stand throughout all time to come. The great purpose of the Bible in presenting this Saviour to the world will never be lost sight of, or fail in its comforting influence upon the hearts and lives of believers though it be sometimes obscured by trusted teachers, or sceptically inclined critics.

It is not a question of honesty or sincerity so much—for our Bible critics may be never so honest and sincere, and may stand high for Christian character—but a question of *evidence, and judgment of interpretation, and historical fact.* But whether the studies and conclusions of Bible critics be wise or unwise, it is not wise in those engaged in the active ministry to be switched off to side issues, and give much consideration to them. The chief thought of the Bible, presenting a living Christ, able and willing to save dying humanity, ought certainly to be the chief thought of those called to preach the Gospel, and minister to the needs of sin-distressed men and women.

The Bible tells us what God is as Creator, Sovereign and

Father; as Redeemer, Protector and final Deliverer from evil and sin; as the Begetter of spiritual life; the Sanctifier and Comforter of members in God's family. From the account we have of God's dealings with man, and the revelation of His divine will we come to know Him in all His attributes and perfections. But we are not saved merely by such knowledge. Our Salvation must come through personal contact and union with the living Christ. The Bible is only a means to an end—the calling attention to what God is and has for sinners. The book itself does not save; it only tells how we may be saved, viz: by the acceptance of, and surrender to, the Christ of whom it teaches. Christ could save, just as well, if the Bible had never been written, but how could we know of Him, if we were not taught the truth concerning Him? Knowing of Him, we may go to Him, as the source of spiritual life, and find it in Him.

Believing in Him, we become partakers of His life in such a way as to become one with Him, and partakers in the riches of divine grace. It is necessary, therefore, to hold the Bible and Christ in right relation to each other. He is more than anything else *its content*, and, by the enlightenment of the Holy Spirit, we come to appreciate and appropriate all that He is revealed to be. As we are divinely taught (Luke 24 : 44, 45), the Sacred Scriptures can only be understood by those to whom the Holy Spirit shows the truth of the divine record, and reveals its Christ. There are many people who have little or no education, and yet know more of Christ and His Salvation, than some professed theologians. The reason is the former are Spirit-taught, while the latter are not. We do not, of course, underestimate learning in interpreting the scriptures, but learning, without the Holy Spirit's help, would leave us in blindness, as to the saving power of a living Christ. The teaching of the truth and the Spirit applying the truth belong together in bringing man to a saving knowledge of Christ. "What God has joined together let not man put asunder."

God comes to man in nature, it is true, and, to an extent, re-

veals Himself through an intellectual apprehension of the truth, no matter where or how revealed. But He comes to man especially by divine inspiration of His will, as revealed in the sacred Scriptures and applied to heart and conscience by the secret, effective work of the Divine Spirit. Of course, He speaks to us also in history and providence. We learn much of His will by what He has wrought in His dealings with men, but only in the light of Scripture teaching; and yet no man ever learned to know Christ, savingly, or found the way of salvation, except through *Spirit-applied* truth as contained in the scriptures, or the teaching of the living Christ (when He tabernacled upon earth) and of which we have the substance, as recorded in the gospels and epistles of the New Testament. Since the days of inspired apostles there has only been one way to find out God and His will, and that is by the study or teaching of the Scriptures, which teaches of a divine-human, suffering, dying, risen, exalted and ever-living Christ; brought to spiritual consciousness by the Holy Spirit's enlightening, regenerating presence, in response to repentance and faith. If theological students or ministers of the Gospel go to the scriptures, *in the spirit of critics*, to find out what is true, they will never find the essential truth that maketh wise unto salvation, or that will be of very much benefit to them or those to whom they preach. Intellectual study of the Bible must not be despised or neglected, but it must always be in the spirit of humble, teachable believers, and in dependence upon the Holy Spirit's aid.

Having thus placed ourselves in right relation to the Bible, we are in a position to interpret it and learn its true purpose, namely, to make real to us the Christ it reveals—the alpha and omega of its content. Thus do we ourselves, and those we teach, come to an *experimental and saving knowledge* of what God would have us know for our present and eternal comfort. Such saving knowledge will also constrain us to a holy obedience of the truth. We will live and rejoice in the will of Christ as our own, and be free from the bondage of sin-fallen life. Sin will, of course, remain in us, but only as an outlaw. We will not be subject to its power or dominion.

So, I repeat, the chief purpose of the Bible, from cover to cover, is to make known primarily to the intellect, and through it to the inner consciousness of the soul—the Son of God, in union with the Son of Mary, victorious over sin, death and hell, as the Redeemer and Saviour of the race. What a grand purpose this is; worthy of the great God who formed and executed it! How it exalts and dignifies man that he should be divinely chosen to be the medium of the communication of such great grace! How comforting also to the preacher of gospel truth to know that it does not depend so much upon his eloquence, or learning, as to whether his hearers shall be benefited by the truth as it does upon the Spirit of God, who is ever present to apply it, with saving effect! We may admit that there is a great deal in the Bible that to human wisdom might have been omitted without impairing its value to us of to-day; we may admit that in the many translations of it, through the ages, some errors have crept into our canon that are not strictly of advantage to receive as truth; yet, if we have spiritual eyes to see, and spirit-filled hearts to apprehend and appreciate the great truth, which it is the purpose of the Bible to unfold and impress, we cannot read, preach or study this book of God with any other than a conscious feeling that by it God in Christ comes into our souls, filling a void that nothing else can; and satisfying a longing that can be satisfied in no other way.

Remember, we do not say that the book called the Bible is absolutely necessary to a full and saving knowledge of Christ. He may be revealed by oral teaching, or by truth, orally handed down from inspired teachers, but what we do contend for is, that God, in His infinite wisdom and goodness, has chosen to give us a record of truth in the Bible that is authentic and reliable, as regards the provision made for our salvation.

He has further chosen, through its teaching, to give us a saving hope that we may lay hold upon and realize that we are saved, as the Spirit enables us to accept the Christ presented to faith. Why talk about refusing to believe that we cannot bring within the compass of the finite intellect? Why not rather say we know *because* we believe, for this is the fact?

Under the theocracy God was revealed *first* as the sovereign of intelligent creation to whom all owe allegiance; *second* as a holy and righteous Judge, who punishes all violations of His divine law, and *third* as a very Merciful Father ready and willing to forgive sin, when the guilty are truly repentant. But He cannot and will not set aside justice to save the sinner from the consequences of his sin. Foreseeing man's fall, it was planned from all eternity to save believers consistently with justice, though the sacrifice, merit and mediation of His Son. God wanted man to know this, that he might not despair in his lost and miserable condition. Accordingly He first revealed this great truth to Adam, even before he was driven from Eden for his sin. So also the same blessed truth was revealed to patriarchs, from time to time, so that their faith in a promised Messiah might be kept in active exercise. The Messiah to come, it was clearly taught, was to be the "seed of the woman." The sacrifices and ceremonies of the law all pointed to and had their meaning in Him. Those who believed in Him were already saved, as really as we who believe in Him now, for He was the same then that He is now, though in history He had not yet appeared in visible form. The union of the divine and human in His person may be said to have been complete from all eternity, and must have been, if He was "slain from the foundation of the world." But though under the old dispensation, the full truth, concerning the Messiah and Deliverer could not, in the nature of things, be understood, enough was known and believed to fill the soul of the true child of God with saving hope and blessed assurance of a full complete salvation.

It was the divine purpose to reveal this fundamental truth in such ways as, at the time, man could comprehend. Having made this revelation (whether by audible voice, in visions and dreams; by Heavenly messengers or other theophenies) it was also a gracious provision of divine love to inspire suitable men to write, record, and hand down to posterity the truth that had been thus revealed. So Moses, or some one else (it matters not who) wrote Pentateuch; so others (it matters not who) gave us the other books

of the Old Testament Scriptures, all having the same chief purpose, viz: to reveal Christ, a deliverer of those who believe in, and accept Him.

As already intimated, it may be that there is in the Bible a great deal of filling up with detail, and unimportant historical matter; it may be that patriarchs and prophets drew on their imagination, to an extent, in some things that they tell us; it may even be that portions, of the Bible are not inspired, and were not intended to be a part of it, but, admitting all this—for argument's sake—the great fact still stands out, and towers up like the pyramids on the plains of Egypt, that a Messiah is promised, and has been provided to redeem man from sin. This is the *internal* and *external evidence* of the *genuineness and integrity* of the thirty-nine books of the Old Testament.

It is impossible to explain away this fundamental truth or on any other theory account for it than that it was, and is, the purpose of God to reveal the Christ of history as the Hope and Saviour of the world. It seems as plain as the shining of the noonday sun that the great end of the Old Testament was to bring men to a knowledge of, and a hearty trust in, God as Father who would send a Deliverer; and, by the spirit of truth in revelation to teach of Him as Comforter and Guide, through this world of sin.

When now we come to the New Testament we do not find any new revelation of essential truth, but a fulfillment of that before revealed. Of necessity, the actual, visible coming of the Messiah promised, answering precisely to the circumstances under which it was predicted He would come, and in all respects confirming what had been said of Him, shed a clearer light upon the meaning of Old Testament revelation; but the revelation itself was, and is, the same. What the Christ of the New Testament was and is; what He did and taught, when He tabernacled in the flesh, He was, and is, and did, and said for the salvation of sinners who believe in, and accept Him as Saviour. The record of this is so fully authenticated; bears on its face so visibly the evidence of genuineness, that it requires much more credulity to

reject Him as a divine-human Saviour than to believe in, and accept, Him.

No one can possibly study, or even cursorily read the New Testament Gospels and Epistles without finding Jesus of Nazareth and Christ—the Anointed—the same identical person, exhibiting the wisdom, power, and love of God ("God manifest in the flesh") and the central, chief truth of each of its twenty-seven books. So that, in detail and in sum total, the entire sixty-six books of the Sacred Scriptures, we call the Bible, is ONE book *with a single purpose.*

If this be true—as will, of course, be granted by all believers (for whom, especially, we write)—why, we again ask, shall our young men, studying theology, or our older men, in the active Gospel ministry, concern themselves very much about what the critics have to say regarding the UNimportant things relating to or contained in the Bible? Why shall we not devote ourselves in body, intellect and affection with the enthusiasm and interest inspired by the great theme we are set apart to study and preach; hold up CHRIST before men, their only hope and deliverer from the thraldom and dreadful consequences of sin?

Why turn aside from the true purpose of our calling to follow the critics into the mists of speculation and doubt to our discomfort, and that of those we are called to serve? It will in no sense pay. It is all wrong. The better way, the true way, as all experience proves, is to stand by the teachings of the Church and the fundamental things on which the orthodox church catholic agrees.

Ministers of the Gospel, especially, should have right convictions and the courage of their convictions, which they cannot have on doubtful questions. It has been found by experience in all the ages past that a true faith will authenticate itself if based upon the Word of God. Living Christ and teaching Christ must go together if there is to be any success in winning souls to Him. He must be our "all and in all." We find Him in the divine book of revelation, and we must preach Him as revealed.

V.

LIBRARY PROGRESS IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.

BY SAMUEL H. RANCK.

On the threshold of the twentieth century it is interesting and, perhaps, profitable to review what has been done in the nineteenth. Mr. Alfred Russell Wallace calls the nineteenth "the wonderful century" and in a book under that title discusses its successes and failures. "The wise and the foolish, the learned and the unlearned, the poet and the pressman, the rich and the poor," he says, "have not been slow to praise it," though in his opinion our self admiration does not rest upon an adequate appreciation of the facts. The nineteenth century for inventions and discoveries cannot be compared with any other century; it can only be compared with all the preceding centuries of history. In a list of thirty-nine great inventions and discoveries given by Mr. Wallace twenty-four belong to the nineteenth century, and only fifteen to all the ages before.

Libraries cannot be classed as among the inventions and discoveries of the nineteenth century, for there were libraries four thousand years ago. Libraries are, however, a part of the general movement for public education and the diffusion of knowledge. "The wonderful century" has done more for the diffusion of knowledge among men than all the other centuries combined, and the public library as one of the instruments of this diffusion belongs chiefly to the latter half of the century. In 1800 there were less than fifty libraries in the United States and they contained less than a hundred thousand volumes—less than the number of books in the central building of The Enoch Pratt Free Library. The number of libraries and the number of volumes in them for the first seventy-five years of this century have been variously estimated. The following are from reports of the

United States Bureau of Education. In 1836, 57 libraries contained 580,201 volumes; 1856, 66 libraries, 1,012,147 volumes; 1863, 96 libraries, 2,296,607 volumes; 1875, 3,648 libraries, 12,329,526 volumes; 1885, 5,338 libraries, 20,722,393 volumes. In 1900 there were about 7,500 libraries in this country, with an annual income of eight millions of dollars, and they contained nearly forty millions of books. The libraries of 1800 were State, college, society, proprietary, or subscription libraries, and few indeed permitted their books to be used outside the library. Their chief function, in the eyes of those who managed them, was the preservation of knowledge, not its diffusion. The librarian of 1800 was the "keeper" of the books, with duties akin to those of a jailer. With the exception of certain special libraries, the chief business of the librarian to-day is to get people to use the books under his care—to get the books to the people, to make his institution democratic. The best thing that can be done with a book in the eyes of the modern librarian is to wear it out; and the books in the libraries of the United States are now being worn out by the tens of thousands annually and worn out in a legitimate way.

The latest complete statistics for the libraries of the United States (including state, school, society, municipal, free, and subscription libraries) are for the year 1896. They are a part of the report of the United States Bureau of Education for that year. In the report for 1896 only 2,166 libraries gave returns of the number of books used. These 2,166 libraries issued for home use more than thirty-five millions of books, and there were used within the libraries nearly eight millions more. In 1900 at least sixty millions of books belonging to public libraries were used, fifty millions for home use, and ten millions more within their buildings. It is difficult to realize what sixty millions of books means. Their average weight is about a pound and a quarter apiece, and stating it in terms of a railroad report it means 37,500 tons, equal to 750 carloads, in cars of 100,000 pounds capacity, or twenty-five trains of thirty cars each. These books placed on one shelf would extend from New York city to

the Mississippi River. All the books used in the public libraries of the United States in the year 1800 could be carried on a single railroad car of to-day, and if they were placed on a single shelf it would be about a mile long. But the influence of books and of libraries cannot be counted by the car lot, or measured by the mile. These comparisons merely show the physical side of what libraries are doing for the diffusion of knowledge.

Nearly all the libraries at the opening of the century were either college or "subscription" libraries. The latter class owes its origin to Benjamin Franklin in the founding of the Library Company of Philadelphia in 1731, which he termed the "mother of all the North American subscription libraries." The libraries of the type founded by Franklin were used chiefly by the professional classes. They were aristocratic rather than democratic. They include such institutions as the Redwood Library and Athenæum of Newport, R. I., founded in 1747; the Society Library of New York city, 1754; and the Library Company of Baltimore, 1795. Libraries of this class had the field almost to themselves for the first two decades of the nineteenth century.

Beginning with the year 1820 another class of libraries begins to appear. As their names indicate they were designed for mechanics and clerks and were usually organized by persons engaged in such occupations. At least four of them were organized in 1820, beginning in March of that year with the Mercantile Library of Boston, and followed by the Mercantile Library Association of New York city, the Apprentices' Library of Philadelphia, and the Free Library of the General Society of Mechanics and Tradesmen (popularly known as the Apprentices' Library) of New York city. The Mercantile Library of Philadelphia, founded in 1821, belongs to this class also. For over half a century the popular literature was supplied to many of our cities almost entirely by such libraries. The largest library of this class, the New York Mercantile, now contains 265,000 volumes.

In 1827 Governor DeWitt Clinton of New York, in his message to the State Legislature, recommended the formation of school district libraries; but nothing was done till 1835, when

the Legislature passed a law permitting the voters of any school district to levy a tax of $20 to begin a library and a tax of $10 each succeeding year for its increase. Few districts voted the necessary tax. In 1838 the law was amended by appropriating annually $55,000 to the superintendent of public instruction for the purchase of books for school district libraries, requiring each district to raise by taxation an amount equal to that received from the State. This law remained in force until 1892. The plan of school district libraries did not result in what was hoped from it. Twenty-one States at one time or another tried the New York experiment, but none of them spent anything like two millions of dollars on it, as did New York. The school district proved to be too small a unit for efficient library work. The local school boards, on whom devolved the management and the selection of books, were too often unequal to the task, and they had not the means to employ intelligence to direct it. These school district libraries, of course, did some good; but the moral of the whole experiment is that, even with money for new books, libraries do not run themselves.

The next stage in the development of libraries took the city or town (or township) as the unit and led to the passage of laws permitting libraries to be established and supported by taxation for the free use of all the citizens. This movement, both in England and America, belongs almost entirely to the last half of the nineteenth century, and chiefly to the last quarter. In 1833 the town of Peterborough, N. H., under a law applying certain taxes "to the maintenance of common schools or to other purposes of education," established a public library and the next year opened it on Sunday; but before 1850 only two States had passed laws permitting cities or towns to tax themselves for libraries, Massachusetts in 1848 for the Boston Public Library, and New Hampshire in 1849 for the whole State. In 1851 Massachusetts passed an enabling act which applied to the whole State. This was followed by Maine in 1854, Vermont in 1865, Ohio in 1867, and then after 1872 the movement became general, especially in the Western States. In most of the States the laws

provide that the amount of money for library purposes shall not exceed a certain number of mills per dollar of the assessed valuation of taxable property. This is a feature of the Maryland law, passed in 1898. Thus far Queenstown is the only Maryland town that has established a library under this law. A number of southern States have no permission library law, chiefly because there has been no demand for it on the part of the people. Communities that believe education to be the foundation of civic liberty and civic righteousness as well as an important element in human happiness, establish and maintain public libraries.

The newest legislation relating to libraries has been in the creation of state library commissions and in the establishing of state travelling libraries, usually in connection with the State library. Massachusetts created the first free public library commission in 1890; to-day there are seventeen States with such bodies. These commissions for the promotion of the cause of libraries usually consist of five or more well-known librarians of the State who serve without pay. Communities and all interested can go to these commissions for free expert advice on the establishment and management of libraries. The State appropriates a small sum of money for the necessary expenses of the commission. The Massachusetts commission has issued annually most interesting and instructive reports of its work. To-day less than one-half of one per cent. of the people of that State are without the advantages of a free public library. The aggregate population of the towns without these libraries is about ten thousand. The total home use of all the libraries of Massachusetts is now nearly ten millions of books a year.

The first travelling library created by a State law was that of New York in 1892. The first library sent out under that law was on February 8, 1893. At the present time at least seven States have established travelling libraries, though in twenty-five other States similar libraries are carried on by private parties. There are now nearly three thousand travelling libraries (boxes of from twenty-five to one hundred books) in the United States. These libraries are especially useful for rural communi-

ties. The early history of the travelling library movement is more or less obscure. Australia established the system as it is carried on to-day a few years earlier than New York. There were, however, libraries known as "itinerating" libraries, in every essential particular similar to the travelling library of to-day, as long ago as 1834.

On the part of the general public the large gifts or bequests to libraries have probably attracted more attention than any other feature of the movement. The gifts of men like Mr. Carnegie, Mr. Peabody, Mr. Pratt, Mr. Newberry, and others, seem monumental by themselves. They are, however, but a small part of the whole. The last report on this subject at the meeting of the American Library Association in June, 1900, at Montreal, covered a period of two years. There were 458 separate gifts from May, 1898, aggregating in value $10,500,000. This is exclusive of the constant stream of books and pamphlets that goes to every library, large or small. Of the ten and a half millions given in those two years over seven and a quarter millions were in amounts of less than $100,000. Only ten gifts were of amounts of $100,000 or over and only one of more than a million. The total gifts of Mr. Carnegie to libraries amounted last June to $9,600,000; and by this time he has probably passed the ten-million mark. Fifty millions of dollars is a conservative estimate of the total value of the gifts and bequests to American libraries in the last quarter of a century. Twenty-five millions were given in the last ten years.

The greatest agency in the development of libraries and library movement in the United States has been the American Library Association, familiarly spoken of by its members as the A. L. A. This organization is an outgrowth of the Centennial in Philadelphia, where it was organized October 6, 1876. Its motto is, "The best reading for the largest number at the least cost." Its purposes are admirably stated in its handbook: "Its purposes are the promotion of library interests, the interchange of experience and opinion, the obtaining of large results from library labor and expenditure, and the advancement of the

profession in librarianship. The Association seeks to develop and strengthen the public library as an essential part of the American educational system. It therefore strives by individual effort of members, and where practicable by local organization, to stimulate public interest in establishing or improving libraries and thus to bring the best reading within reach of all."

In the last report of the treasurer the membership of the Association was 664. Its annual income has rarely exceeded $1,500. The enthusiasm it fostered has done the work, rather than the dollars of its members. *The Library Journal*, its official organ, is the most important of the publications that owe their origin to the Association, though Poole's Index to Periodical Literature, made possible by the coöperation of the members of the Association, will seem most important to the student and general reader. The great need of libraries twenty-five years ago was the solution of technical and mechanical problems—library economy, involving questions of administration, classification, cataloguing, shelf arrangement, charging systems, library architecture, etc. In a library of a few thousand volumes these problems do not impress their importance; but the larger the library and the more it is used the greater their importance. With development and growth there must be differentiation, and the library that does not solve the technical problems satisfactorily is handicapped in its work. The greatest single contribution to library economy during this period is the development of the card catalogue.

Within the last few years the Association has also been cultivating coöperation in cataloguing. Every day hundreds of libraries are doing the same work on the same book that could and should be done once and for all. Although there are various systems of shelf arrangement now in vogue the cataloguing of the books on cards is essentially alike in all well-regulated libraries, and the time is not far distant when most books will come to our libraries catalogued and ready for the shelves. Interlibrary loans, the lending of books in one library to another, is a feature of library coöperation not generally known. At the cost

of express charges the student can command the resources of nearly all the libraries of the country at the library of his city. For the twentieth century the Association has set itself the task of bringing about international coöperation.

Stimulated by the A. L. A., nineteen States have organized State library associations, and half a dozen cities have organized local library clubs. The Association has created the idea that librarianship is a profession rather than a function, and that special training is necessary for its successful pursuit. As a result there are now four regularly organized library schools, beginning in 1886 with what is now the New York State Library School, at Albany. The requirements for admission to this school are college graduation or its equivalent. The course is two years. The standards for admission to the library schools connected with the Pratt Institute, Brooklyn, the Drexel Institute, Philadelphia, and the University of Illinois, are not so high. Amherst College has conducted a summer library school for a decade, which is attended chiefly by persons now engaged in library work desirous of making themselves more efficient. There is also a library training class at Columbian University, Washington.

The highly organized work of the modern library is demanding buildings with special reference to the work that is being done in them. At least six library buildings in the United States have cost each a million dollars or more, that of the Library of Congress more than six millions. The library of a century ago was all in one room; to-day it tries to have a number of rooms, as many libraries have, such as these: stacks for storing books by the million, delivery, registration and information rooms, reading rooms, general and special, the latter including periodicals, newspapers, patents, public documents, manuscripts, incunabula, prints, music, maps, rooms for writing, smoking, conversation, or reading aloud, rooms for exhibiting for display special collections of books, rooms for children, for the blind, and for women, with specially trained attendants for every class of books and readers, offices of administration, rooms for the chief librarian, the statisticians, engineers, electricians, and

janitors, for the order, catalogue, shelf, and editorial departments, for the bindery and mending departments, a printing office, store rooms, shipping and packing rooms, boiler, engine, dynamo, ventilating and delivery machinery rooms, photographic rooms, lecture halls, kitchen, lunch and rest rooms for the staff, public comfort rooms, coat or check rooms, bicycle rooms, etc., etc.,—all in a central building from which radiates an influence that seeks to make itself felt, through branches and stations, in every nook and corner of a great city.

Four American cities now have libraries with a home circulation of more than a million books a year. The statistics of such use can easily be kept, though these libraries do not neglect other departments where accurate statistics are impossible if the best service is to be rendered to the public. In round numbers the total expense of maintenance, the number of volumes in the library, and the home circulation of the millionnaire libraries for the years last reported is as follows: New York Free Circulating Library, $98,000, 157,777 volumes, circulation, 1,637,000; Free Library of Philadelphia, $162,000, 203,102 volumes, circulation, 1,778,000; Chicago Public Library, $237,000, 258,498 volumes, circulation, 1,750,000; Boston Public Library, $271,000, 746,383 volumes, circulation, 1,252,000. Large as these numbers of circulation are they are larger in one or two libraries of cities in England.

The number of volumes circulated by these libraries seems enormous; and yet there is every reason to believe that these figures will seem small indeed before the twentieth century is two decades old. Less than ten per cent. of the people of the age which entitles them to use the libraries of New York, Philadelphia, and Chicago, have taken out cards enabling them to draw books. More than ninety per cent. of the people who might use them do not. The immediate problem of the public library is to convert this great mass of non-users into users. If one out of every five persons entitled to use the public library of Chicago should do so the annual circulation would now be five millions of volumes. If the per capita use of books in

Baltimore were as great as it is in two cities of Massachusetts to-day the circulation of The Enoch Pratt Free Library would be more than three millions a year. The circulation of our libraries in the twentieth century promises numbers almost beyond comprehension.

But the circulation of books is only one side of the work in which our libraries are engaged. With their reading rooms (often open on Sundays and holidays as well as during the week), their current magazines, their newspapers, and their reference books, they are doing educational work of the first importance, even though it makes little showing in annual reports. For thousands of lives libraries are centers of light and sunshine as well as centers of knowledge. The books that bring sunshine into life are as highly prized by the man who has learned the art of living as are those that bring knowledge, and in the economy of daily life the one class is as important as the other. As a disseminator of sunshine and of knowledge the library enters upon the twentieth century with every prospect that its mission to mankind is only in the years of its infancy.

VI.

NEW TESTAMENT GIVING VERSUS OLD TESTAMENT TITHING.

BY REV. S. REAM.

On the general subject of tithing many books have been written, tracts and leaflets printed and sermons preached, and yet to most people it still remains an abstruse and difficult problem. Whether or not the tithing of one's income, as was done under the Jewish system, should be continued under the Christian economy, is the question at issue. In recent years numerous writers have come forward to support its continuance; but any one with a discriminating mind cannot help but note the perversions, the incongruous statements made, and the misapplications of Scripture in support of their contention.

Believing as we do that the Jewish system of tithing does not hold under the Christian dispensation, the following arguments, based upon Biblical and historical facts, and upon practical ethics, are offered for consideration.

Created a religious being, it is but natural that man should desire to worship and to hold communion with his Maker. A deep sense of gratitude on his part, and a heart full of faith, love and obedience to God, prompt him to render such service. It is also just as natural for him to desire to make some real returns to God for the blessings and mercies he has received. And in these instincts of religion we have the origin of sacrifices, oblations, offerings and tithes. Thus Abel in faith offered the best of his flock and his sacrifice was accepted of God. At first these offerings were not measured or enforced by law, but were altogether voluntary and free. No divine command or instruction was needed, nor is there any record of such command being given; for what is more natural and reasonable than that the soul of man, overflowing with a feeling of gratitude for blessings

received, should seek to express that feeling in some tangible form, just as we see was done in the sacrifices and offerings made to the Lord by his ancient people?

According to the usual definition given, the tithe means the tenth part of anything, or a tax of one-tenth, especially when payable in kind. When a definite money payment is substituted it is known as the commutation of tithes.

The practice of tithing is very ancient, much older indeed than the code of Moses, for we see in Gen. 14:20 already that Abraham gave tithes to Melchizedek, priest of the most high God, of all the booty taken by him in the war against the confederate kings. This was four hundred years before the Mosaic institution; and, over one hundred and fifty years before, Jacob, imitating the piety of his grandfather, vowed that if God would keep him in the way he would give to the Lord the one-tenth of all the substance he might acquire. We thus see that the practice of tithing was already long in vogue among the Hebrews before its incorporation among the Mosaic statutes. From the Mosaic law the system was transferred to the Christian church, east and west, not by authority of Christ or his Apostles, but by the Church Fathers of the third and fourth centuries. It was thus introduced "according to Old Testament example," says Dr. Schaff. To many Christians, however, the system seemed to be not altogether of rightful origin, and it was therefore slow of introduction into the church. To hasten its acceptance it was represented that not to pay tithes was a sin, and its enforcement was therefore commanded by the Council of Macon, 585, under penalty of excommunication. The confessional was also a potent means of enforcing its observance. After the sixth century tithing became a legal duty the neglect of which was followed, in some cases, by civil punishment. Thus the system was gradually imposed upon the various sections of the church until, by the thirteenth century, nearly all of Christendom was practicing it. The system remained until the Reformation, but it was not even then abolished at once; for, like many other practices that had fastened upon the church, this one also remained for a

while; but in the course of time, a strong opposition arose against the system, some countries abolishing it altogether, while others commuted the tithes into a fixed annual sum of money. In England and Sweden tithing still exists and is kept up by the laws of the state.

The practise of tithing among the Hebrews was also very generally copied by the surrounding Gentile nations. Among the Greeks and Romans the tenth part of their increase and the spoils of war was frequently dedicated to their gods, Jupiter, Mars, Hercules and Diana. The Carthagenians sent a tenth of their profits to the Hercules of Tyre. The Pelasgians paid tithes to the oracle of Apollo at Delphi. A tenth was exacted on the imports of the Babylonians; and in the fiscal system of the Mohammedan states the tithe still forms a component element.

The objects annually tithed under the Mosaic law, except during the sabbatical year, consisted of cattle, sheep and the fruits of the ground; of the latter the chief were corn, wine and oil. The principal tithes paid annually were two in number. The tenth part of the fruits of the ground and of the herds were given for the maintenance of the Levites for their services both sacred and civil, this tribe having received no land inheritance. Out of this the Levites gave one tenth to the priests who were taken from this tribe. A second tenth was devoted to the feasts and sacrifices as a sign of rejoicing and gratitude to God. These feasts were partaken of at the tabernacle or temple, the Levites joining in the festivities. It seems to have been the practice also for the people to celebrate these feasts every third year at their homes with the Levites, strangers, fatherless and widows as guests. Whether there were three tithes taken this third year, or the third tithe is to be understood as simply a description of the second, is not certainly known. While some writers on the subject hold that there were only two, Josephus distinctly says there were three. (Deut. 14–28; Jos. Ant. B. 4, C. 8, § 12. The least amount, then, that the Jews gave was the one fifth (one tenth to the Levites and one tenth for the feasts and sacrifices), with possibly an added tenth every third year to the poor. This, to-

gether with the other offerings that they made, would bring the amount up to at least one fourth or one third part of their annual income. Some suppose that it was even more than that. Zaccheus, a Jew, said, "Behold, Lord, the half of my goods I give to the poor." Now whatever amount may have been given by the jews, it is certain that it was more than the tenth part. And yet the shibboleth among some modern advocates of tithing is that as a tenth was paid by God's ancient people, therefore we ought also to give a like amount. Now this statement, as they ought to know, is woefully lacking in accuracy; for the Jews, as just seen, were required to, and did, pay much more than that. Then why insist on the payment of a specific amount, the one tenth, which in truth does not express the standard of giving which they profess to copy after?

But it is rejoined by others that one tenth simply expresses the minimum amount we ought to give to the Lord's cause, and, in addition thereto, as much more as we are able. This view, as often presented, does not help matters, for there is still the compliance with the Levitical law of tithing, which, together with other laws of like character, have, as we shall see, no place in the Christian economy. As before observed, the laws of Moses required the giving of at least the one fifth, which but few modern tithers come up to, while in the patriarchal age strictly the tenth was given, and that without outward constraint. If, then, tithers are sincere in their belief, and would imitate with exactness the law of Moses in this matter, consistency would require them to contribute not only the one tenth, but at least two tenths or more. To give only the one tenth would be in harmony with the patriarchal period, but not with the code of Moses.

In addition to the regular tithes the loyal Jews also made voluntary offerings. At the feast of tabernacles the people made a free-will offering according as the Lord had blessed them. When the tabernacle, and afterwards the temple, was erected, the people, out of the fullness of their hearts, offered willingly to the Lord. In Ezra it is said "The silver and the gold are a free-

will offering to the Lord." They also gave for the use of the priests a part of the first fruits of all the products of their husbandry, as wheat, oil, grapes, fruits of trees, herbs, and firstlings of their flocks; the quantity thus given being left entirely to the free will of the giver. The wants of the poor were provided for in part by the unprescribed quantities of grain left in the corners of the fields, and of the gleanings of the oliveyards and vineyards. They also had free access to all that grew spontaneously in the fields and vineyards every seventh year, when the soil was left uncultivated. In the bestowment of all these gifts and charities it was not required of the Jews that they give of their income a tenth or any other specific sum, but the amount so given was unmeasured and unprescribed. "Every man shall give as he is able, according to the blessing of the Lord thy God."

But tithers contend that the one tenth [an assumption again of the tenth!] is what we owe God, and that "Nothing should be said about giving until what we owe is paid." Rich indeed must man be if the nine tenths of his income, and all that he lays claim to, is his very own, and only the one tenth belongs to God! Yet it is said "The earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof." Strictly speaking, nothing is ours, all belongs to God. Of this, however, we may, as his stewards, use enough to meet the necessities of life, the amount to be returned to the Lord being determined by the smallness or largeness of such personal needs. How then can it be that just one tenth, no more, no less, is owing to God, when the balance over and above the necessaries of life is so indeterminate? Rather say that the measure of our returns to God depends more naturally upon the measure of our prosperity, or ability to give. This granted, it cannot in any proper sense be said that we "owe" to God the one tenth, or any other specific amount. Consequently whatever amount we return to the Lord, we may, in the Bible sense, be said to "give" to the Lord.

Tithing has already been referred to as being a part of the Levitical law. Let it be emphasized that this requirement that

the tenth be given to the Levites, and out of this a tenth to the priests, was purely Levitical in its character, and, being such, it holds no place in the Christian economy. Those who try to make it appear that tithing is not a Levitical, but altogether a moral law, fail to distinguish clearly between the two. Giving is of itself a moral act, because it is based upon the principle of duty; but when the amount thus given is limited to the one tenth for the Levites, and a second tenth for the joyous feasts, the whole serving purely a Levitical purpose, and being strictly inherent in the Levitical economy, then it certainly is a Levitical law. So, when the Levitical economy passed away, that which was peculiarly inherent in it also passed away. But the act itself of giving, being purely moral, and not peculiar to any economy or system of religion, is still a most imperative duty. The same method of reasoning applies to the Sabbath day. As an institution it was observed as a rest day before the time of Moses; but when it was incorporated in the Mosaic code it became a peculiarly Jewish institution. As a day of rest its observance was a moral duty, but the observance of any one day in preference to another had in it no moral quality. So when the Apostles and early Christians began to observe the first day of the week instead of the seventh they broke no moral law, because the Sabbath as an institution was still continued; only the day itself, as observed by the Jews, was changed. The primary object of the Sabbath is holiness, not merely rest from labor. "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy." "God blessed the Sabbath day and hallowed it; *because that in it* he rested from all his work." The spirit of the command is fulfilled whether the six days' labor be on the last six days of the week or the first six days. Therefore the day itself may be changed, as it was changed, and yet as an institution, hallowed and blessed, it remains intact.

So, also, giving is still a duty, but tithing in giving, simply because it is Jewish, is no longer binding.

It will be noted that civic as well as sacred duties were performed by the Levites. At one stage in their history there were appointed of them six thousand judges and scribes and four

thousand gate-keepers; so that the tithe that went to them was not altogether for the maintenance of religion, but was a tax upon the people for the support of the state as well. Such being the case the tithe system can not be urged with the same force, nor applied at all in our day as it was in the Levitical economy. In civic matters specific taxes may be and are rightfully imposed and collected for the support of the state, every loyal citizen bearing a fair proportion of the burden. Jesus himself recognized civil authority and paid the required tribute money. But in the sphere of religion a difference obtains. The Church, differing from the state, as it does, in the nature of its laws, and lacking the power of administering civil punishment, could not, in a free country, compel by coercive measures the collection of tithes, as the state does in collecting its taxes; but is permitted to employ only spiritual weapons, which is, after all, simply equivalent to an appeal to the conscience and free will.

Appeal is sometimes made to Christ and the apostles in defense of tithing. It is argued that though the New Testament does not, in specific terms, restate the command to tithe, yet neither does it forbid it. To this it may be said that if the continuance of tithing is not prohibited in so many words, yet neither in its tenor and spirit, nor in its teaching, does it offer even *a tithe* of comfort to the supporters of the system. What says the New Testament, therefore, in the matter of benevolence? Were specific returns required to be made to the Lord, or were they not altogether voluntary and free? An intelligent understanding of the various passages cited ought to leave no room for doubt in the matter. We know that some of the early Christians, in the ardor of their first love, doled not out a tenth, but gave away all their possessions. The poor widow who cast her two mites into the temple treasury cast in more, according to her ability, than the rich, who, of their superfluity, cast in much, but she gave all her living. The large-hearted Dorcas, who provided clothing for the poor, was certainly not limited in her acts of mercy, for it is said that she was full of good works and alms deeds which she did. When Mary, sister of Lazarus, poured the

cruse of exceeding precious ointment upon the head of Jesus as he sat at meat he highly commended her for her act. Would it not be straining a point, however, to infer, even remotely, that this quantity of perfume was simply Mary's offering to Christ of the Jewish tenth? As only crowned heads and those of great wealth could afford to keep in store such an immense quantity of this valuable ointment, the inference is, therefore, too far fetched for serious consideration. Rather say that Mary's heart was overflowing with love to Christ, and that there might be some correspondence between her love and her gift, without regard to quantity, she offered the best she had, though at so much cost to herself. "She hath done what she could" is, indeed, a most beautiful tribute of praise to her from the lips of the Master, and shall ever be held in sweet remembrance of her.

Luke 11 : 42 is frequently referred to by tithers in defense of their position; but we fear that the small comfort they derive from even this passage must be taken from them. Jesus here pronounces a woe upon the Pharisees because they tithed mint and rue and every herb, but passed over judgment and the love of God. He then adds, "These ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone." Jesus means to say to them that as Jews it was proper for them to observe even the smallest points of the law, but yet not to neglect its weightier matters. He does not condemn them for their exactness in tithing, but for assuming that this would atone for the neglect of greater duties. As Jews they were expected to keep the whole law. Now when Jesus said "these ought ye to have done," referring to the tithing of mint and rue, on which there were such pitiful returns in revenues, it would be a forced interpretation to say that this was meant to apply to Christians, for he was not addressing them at all, but to the Pharisees, whom he was denouncing for their inconsistency and hypocrisy.

From the numerous references in the New Testament to the Apostles and their co-laborers, it is inferred that in their travels they were dependent altogether upon the voluntary support of believers. "The laborer is worthy of his hire;" yet it would be

unnatural to suppose that in their journeyings among both believers and heathen any system of tithing would be at all practicable. Persecuted and suffering losses as did the early Christians, we can not help being favorably impressed with their liberality and self-denying love. Yet nothing is said of the believers among whom Christ and Peter and Paul and others labored having offered to their guests any prescribed portion for their own or the church's use, but they gave to them as they had need.

Hard pressed for New Testament precedent, tithers sometimes point to Luke, 3 : 11 in support of their contention that some specific amount ought to be given. "He that hath two coats, let him impart to him that hath none; and he that hath meat let him do likewise." From this the rule is derived that at least one half our income is to be the measure of our charities. Clearly this is not the meaning here taught, and with tithers themselves it is simply a theory without practice. Plainly the Baptist's words are directed against the reigning avarice and selfishness of the day. Food and raiment are necessities of life, and he who has an ample supply, or a superfluity of these things, ought to give to the destitute. For if we ourselves are unkind and uncharitable towards the needy, we can not expect God's favors and mercies upon us. This passage, then, does not support the rule of giving any specific amount, and no commentator that we know of sustains such an interpretation.

More frequently than any other passage, perhaps, tithers quote Matt. 5 : 17, 18. "Think not that I came to destroy the law or the prophets; I came not to destroy, but to fulfill. For verily I say unto you, till Heaven and earth pass away, one jot or one tittle shall in nowise pass away from the law, till all things be accomplished." In these verses Jesus evidently intended, in part, to disabuse the minds of the disciples of any prejudice they might have that he purposed to destroy the law, as the Jews through their rabbinical teachings had in various ways done. They had abrogated its force by their traditions and perversions, by their observance of the letter and not the spirit, and by their false inferences and interpretations. Now in opposition to all

this, Jesus tells the disciples that he came to give completeness, spirituality and life to the law; not to do away with the Old Testament Scriptures, but to complete or to cause the fulfillment of their predictions. The Saviour's direct reference, however, is to the body of moral laws given to the Jews. These, growing as they do out of the very nature of things, cannot be changed or abrogated. They are an integral part of God's word. Such for example is the law of love and obedience to God, for it can never be right to hate or to disobey God. On the other hand the ceremonial law, appointed of God to regulate the rites and ceremonies of his ancient people, can be changed whenever circumstances change, or a new economy is introduced. Now these, as types and shadows of things to come, have been fulfilled in Christ. All the laws, types and ceremonies; the rites and sacrifices of Jewish worship and the priesthood which received its support from the tithe, had their fulfillment in Jesus of Nazareth, when, as the Lamb of God, he died upon Calvary,

> "A sacrifice of nobler name,
> And richer blood than they."

"Tithing," says an advocate of the system, "was given a place in the law of Moses;" and then, to establish his position, he quotes the words of Christ above referred to, "not a jot or tittle shall pass from the law." But seemingly intent only on gaining his point, he purposely omits the explanatory clause immediately following, "till all be accomplished." As before observed, tithing was a Levitical law, and this, with all its jots and tittles, has been fulfilled in Christ. Added piquancy is given this subject by Dr. Schaff's comments. Says he, "The whole Mosaic law is indeed abolished in a certain sense, namely, in its national and temporal form and as a killing litter, but in its spirit and essence it is confirmed, sharpened, deepened and brought to perfection by Jesus Christ." Dr. Harbaugh, a respected authority, writes these words: "It is true that the Jewish law of tithes is not binding on us." Then, if not binding on us, the law itself being abolished, we are certainly under no obligation to observe it.

Rather than the Jewish lawgiver, the great expounder of

Christian ethics is the Apostle Paul. Himself receiving a Jewish training, a Pharisee of the "straitest sect," and, as such, observing the letter of the law, including tithe-paying; yet when he became a Christian and an apostle, he no longer conformed to the peculiarly Jewish laws and customs, but practised and taught a system of morals which was more in accord with the new faith he had adopted. Nowhere in his epistles, therefore, does he counsel the adoption of the tithing system. But, without anticipating his plan, let us carefully follow him in his teachings on the subject. In his second letter to the Corinthians, the 8th chapter, he sets before them the beautiful example of the Macedonian Christians, who, having "first given themselves to the Lord," "gave of their own accord" out of their humble means for the poor saints at Jerusalem. Poor themselves, yet they "abounded unto the riches of liberality." The natural inference is that their liberality, which was even "beyond their power," far exceeded in amount the Jewish tenth; but, prompted by the worthiness of the cause, out of large hearts they made large gifts. It is this spirit of large-heartedness that the apostle would have the well-to-do Christians at Corinth imitate; for to whom much has been given, of him also will be much required; and to whom little has been given, of him little will be required. In the ninth chapter Paul counsels against compulsion in giving; but to give cheerfully and as their hearts prompted them, or from a free self-determination to give. "Every man *as he purposeth in his heart*, so let him give; not grudgingly or of necessity, for God loveth a cheerful giver."

Paul also speaks of the abolishment of the law (Eph. 2 : 15; Col. 2 : 14). In so doing he refers to those laws and ordinances of a temporary nature, Christ having taken them out of the way, "nailing them to the cross." Thus all those laws and ceremonies which served only a transient purpose have been fulfilled in Christ. To love God with all the heart is more than burnt offerings and sacrifices. But Christ became our High Priest, offering himself a sacrifice for our sins, and thus did away with the Jewish priesthood. The priesthood abolished, there no

longer exists the necessity of the tithing system for its support. Therefore, to continue the system is no more reasonable than that we should offer the sacrificial lamb, or eat unleavened bread, or observe any other rite.

Christ having made an end of the Levitical law, Paul declares the end of the necessity of circumcision in the flesh, and says of the Jewish feast days and Sabbaths that they were merely shadows of things to come (Col. 2). In this same category, because of its Levitical character, may be included the law of tithes also.

We now turn to 1 Cor. 16:1, 2. "Now concerning the collection for the saints, as I gave order to the churches of Galatia, so also do ye. Upon the first day of the week let each one of you lay by him in store, as he may prosper, that no collections be made when I come." It is assumed by tithers that this scripture has no reference to general benevolence, but refers solely to the special collection taken for the poor at Jerusalem. If this be the exegesis, what then becomes of all the other wise counsels and commands given by Paul to the Christians at Corinth, such as those relating to the disorderly scenes in church assemblies, the desecration of the Lord's Supper, the exercise of spiritual gifts, marriage, divorce, contentions, divisions, etc.? The truth is we often quote what Paul enjoins on these subjects as authoritative for present-day action. Now these commands were not less local in their application than was the weekly offering he enjoined upon the Corinthian Christians. But not only were the Corinthians to make such offering upon the first day of the week, but also the churches in Galatia, and, with reasonable certainty, those in Macedonia, Achaia and the church at Rome. It would seem that the Galatians were to be an example to the Corinthians, the Corinthians to the Macedonians, and the Corinthians and Macedonians to the Romans. We thus see that the command was given not to any one particular church only, to serve some special purpose, but to many churches and to have been of a general character, and so held out for imitation by the church in all future ages. Further, as the messengers from Corinth had besought Paul

as to the best mode of making their offerings, it is reasonable to suppose that the system the Apostle gave them was the very best that could be given, whether to any local church or to the church in general—better than the tithing system in vogue among the Jews, else *it* rather than the weekly offering would have been ordered by him. Paul was also "careful to do all things in a seemly manner, not only in the sight of the Lord, but also in the sight of men." His rule of giving, then, has the divine sanction and, as there can be only one true standard of benevolence, no amount of caviling can change it. In these verses also Paul grants liberty of judgment in the matter of giving, prescribing no fixed proportion as under the ancient dispensation. The giver is left to estimate the portion he is to give to the Lord, and the portion he is himself to retain, and then to apply each to its proper use. The constraint to give comes from within and not from without, showing thereby that God is willing to honor us with his confidence. When Christians rightly understand their relation to the church and the duties growing out of such relation, the gifts that they statedly bring and "lay" upon God's altar, are a fair index to the measure of their intelligence, gratitude and love. Failure to give is oftener due to lack of instruction than to lack of willingness or ability to give. The beauty and worth of Paul's rule are also seen in its freedom from parade and show, and the opportunity afforded of determining the amount to be given in the privacy of one's own home, quietly reflecting amidst the blessings that God showers upon his children. It has the advantage too, of keeping the general subject of benevolence on the mind from week to week; and the recurrence of giving on every Lord's day gives it more of the semblance of an act of worship, which it really is when done in the proper spirit. This is a feature of church service that must not be lost sight of; and, though the sums thus given weekly be not large, yet at the end of the year the aggregate will be no inconsiderable amount.

To contend that Christian sought to pay tithes simply because the Jews did so, savors not a little of the old time Pharisaical legalism. The Pharisees, as is well known, paid scrupulous re-

gard to the observance of all external forms and ceremonies, and in so doing separated themselves for the most part from the other Jews. They constantly opposed our Lord in all His teachings, and His discourses were therefore frequently directed against them. Now, then, it was just these legalistic notions and Judaizing tendencies that the Apostle Paul in nearly all his writings sought to remove from the minds of Christians. Said he, "With freedom did Christ set us free: stand fast therefore, and be not entangled again in a yoke of bondage." Peter, addressing the council at Jerusalem with reference to circumcision, says, "Why tempt ye God, that ye should put a yoke upon the neck of the disciples, which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear?" With like propriety and force of application may it be said of the Jewish tenth-giving that it is a "yoke" which in Christian times no New Testament writer asks us to "bear."

When about the year 41 A. D. the famine prevailed in Judea, the Christians at Antioch sent relief to their brethren according to every man's "ability." This one word, we think, suggests the true standard of benevolence. God does not require us to deny ourselves of the actual necessities of life, but only of some of its comforts and superadded blessings, that we might thereby give a goodly portion to His cause. Says an unknown writer, "The *minimum* of giving is ability, and the *maximum* is to give so as not to prevent us from meeting our obligations to creditors and providing for the present and after needs of our households." With God that is the most acceptable gift which is in exact proportion to the increase with which God has prospered us. As a just Treasurer He reckons the value of what is given by the amount that is retained. It is not always those whose income is the largest that can and do contribute the most largely. Indeed it is often otherwise. Take a case: One man has a large income, while that of another is only half as large. But the first has a large family to support, his rents are high, there is sickness in the home, and he has heavy bills to pay; so that at the end of the year he has but little or nothing left to his credit. The other is not thus handicapped. His income is much less, but still he

gets a comfortable living from it, and has a neat surplus to add to his bank account. We submit, now, whether in this and in numberless other cases the Mosaic law of paying a tenth of one's *income* does not act as an injustice, and whether also it does not seem to be at variance with the New Testament standard of giving as God hath prospered us? The tithing of one's income would therefore, in many instances, be manifestly out of harmony in giving according to the rule of one's "ability." A rule of benevolence so narrow in its application as not to cover all possible cases, ought not to be proposed for acceptance by Christian people. Little wonder then that Paul "gave order" (I Cor. 16 : 1) to the Galatians and Corinthians, and, as we believe, through them to Christians of all after ages, to observe the higher rule of Christian beneficence, namely, as God has prospered us.

Let it be said, however, that in numerous cases the tenth of one's income seems to be about the correct or equitable amount that, measured by ability, ought to be given to the Lord's cause. Yet, when the income is less, God expects less than the tenth; when more, then more than the tenth. "For unto whomsoever much is given, of him shall much be required." Christian giving ought then to be as much more than the one-tenth as the temporal and spiritual blessings are greater and more numerous, or as much less as such blessings are in number and quantity less. However, in God's account spiritual things are measured in terms of quality and not of quantity. When the right quality is at hand the quantity is regulated in conformity therewith. God's mercies and blessings towards us know no limits. How then can we make specific returns to God, as though we owed him just so much and no more? If God's love to us is unbounded, our love to Him ought to be with all the heart, soul, mind and strength. In the matter of forgiveness the rabbis taught that an offender might be forgiven three times, but no more. Even Peter regarded forgiveness as something outward and quantitative rather than inward and spiritual, and therefore thought himself unusually liberal in proposing seven times as the limit. But Jesus returns the reply, not three times, nor seven times, but

seventy times seven, which was a symbolical expression for never-ending forgiveness. The largeness of the number shows that there is to be no such limitation. God greatly honors us, therefore we should without stint bestow honor and praise upon God. It is our duty to be kind and forebearing, and to have a feeling of sympathy for the unhappy and suffering. But as to how much we ought to honor God and love Him, and to show kindness to the poor, and to sympathize with the suffering, and so on *ad infinitum*, the answer is found only in the words of Jesus, "Until seventy times seven," that is, numbers have nothing to do with the matter. So in regard to giving. As Heaven's blessings are not doled out to us, neither does God require that our gifts to Him be measured in terms of quantity; but He rather considers their quality, and looks upon the heart's purpose in the bestowal of our gifts. In other words, in spiritual things we are to bestow gifts as we receive them, *without limitation.*

The voluntary system of benevolence is more in harmony with the evangelical nature of the Church, and calls forth greater self denial and sacrifice than any compulsory system. When the Free Church of Scotland seceded from the established Church and adopted the voluntary plan of giving, its revenues were vastly increased, and its contributions for missions more than doubled those of the State Church, in which tithing was practiced. Thus we see that when once the spirit of Christian love and liberality is awakened amongst the people, then will their offerings flow more freely into our Church treasuries. Cautious, then, ought the legislative branches of the Church to be in the matter of attempting by enactments to coerce the people into giving, or to lay undue emphasis upon the *per capita* "assessments" made upon them. Demands made which in small part only are complied with serve only to weaken the respect which one should have for church law and authority. People endowed with reason take to sound arguments and will bear lots of kindly persuasion, and, according as they are impressed with the worthiness of a cause, will they respond with their gifts. Giving under restraint conduces to giving "grudgingly or of necessity."

In fine, the system of tithing was well enough adapted to the child age of human progress, when it was brought into use at first spontaneously by the nations, and afterwards incorporated into the Mosaic code; but as since then there has been great growth in all lines of religious thought, other revelations made, and a later and brighter economy introduced, it is rightly supposed that we have outgrown the child age of tithing practiced by these earlier nations.

In the matter of giving, then, instead of copying after a system having its origin in the infantile age of the human race, and belonging to an economy which has been replaced by the Christian dispensation, Christians ought to follow the New Testament rule of giving, which is, as the Lord has prospered them, according to ability, statedly, voluntarily, liberally, cheerfully; and, in thus doing, fulfill the law of Christ, "Freely ye received, freely give."

VII.

MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE.

BY REV. CYRUS CORT, D.D.

Marriage is a divine institution. It had its origin before the fall of mankind. It is one of the few remains of the Lost Paradise. It was intended to promote the happiness, the safety and very existence of the human race. The family is the unit of society, the type of both Church and State, and marriage, or the life union of one man with one woman, is the basis of the family. Male and female created He them. One male and one female, united in marriage, is the fountain head of humanity. Polygamy, or anything else that disturbs or destroys the divine original of marriage, as that was ordained and established in the Garden of Eden before the Fall, is a perversion of the right ways of God and must bring harm and misery to human society. Not only by the creation of a single pair of human beings but by the laws of propagation, implanted in the human constitution as exemplified in the history of the race, did the Almighty ordain monogamy to be the normal order of the sexes.

Birth statistics show that about equal numbers of each sex are born from generation to generation. In the United States there are at present over a million and a quarter more males than females taking the whole country into account, although in some states the females outnumber the males. Advance emigration of males to new States or to mining regions accounts for the excess. Polygamy has been advocated and partially justified at times when a large proportion of the males had been slain in battle. But war itself is wrong and inhuman, and one wrong cannot justify another. The marriage of one man to one woman, until death dissolves the bond, is the divine appointment, the normal order and the one most conducive to the health and happiness of mankind. Individuals and nations that disregard this arrange-

ment must suffer the penalty that always follows the violation of divine laws and institutions. Polygamy brought discord and contention, jealousy and strife, into the households even of the most prudent and pious of the Old Testament Patriachs, and every nation that has sanctioned polygamy has degenerated physically, morally and politically. The Turkish Empire would have perished long ago had not the ambitions and rivalries of Christian nations prevented them from agreeing upon the principle of division that shall prevail in the final dismemberment. And who doubts that polygamy is not the prolific source of the worst ills that afflict the sick man on the Bosphorus? In harmony with the original institution of marriage is the proclamation of the Mediator of the New Covenant from the Mount of Beatitudes, as recorded in the fifth chapter of Matthew (vs. 31 and 32), and as amplified in the nineteeth chapter, When the Pharisees came unto Jesus "tempting Him and saying unto Him, Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause?" "He answered and said unto them, Have ye not read that He which made them at the beginning, made them male and female. And said for this cause shall a man leave father and mother and shall cleave to his wife and they twain shall be one flesh. Therefore, they are no more twain but one flesh. What, therefore, God hath joined together let not man put asunder."

"And when the Pharisees objected that Moses commanded to give a writing of divorcement and to put away a wife for various causes Jesus replied that Moses because of the hardness of your hearts suffered (did not command but allowed or permitted) you to put away your wives; but from the beginning it was not so." The original ideal of marriage had been woefully perverted by fallen man and, like slavery, the evil of divorce was one of such vast proportions in the constitution of ancient society that it could not be abruptly brought to an end but could only be regulated, mitigated and gradually superceded by the original, normal state of things under the sanctifying influences of a higher order of spiritual life. But no matter what Moses allowed but did not command, as the Pharisees asserted, no matter what the mediator

of the Old Testament permitted in deference to the spirit of the age and the prevailing hardness of heart and depravity of mankind, "I say unto you," saith Jesus, in the same connection with all that has been already quoted, "whosoever shall put away his wife except it be for fornication and shall marry another committeth adultery; and whoso marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery."

These passages give us the classic New Testament authority on the subject of marriage and divorce. They cover the ground in so complete a way as to prevent wrong inferences in either direction. The Roman Catholic Church is wrong when it seeks to strike out the exception and make the marriage bond indissoluble under all circumstances. A large part of the Episcopalian Church seems disposed to hold the same position. That is going beyond what is written and authorized by the Heavenly Bridegroom, the Lord Jesus Christ Himself, and instead of promoting the sanctity of marriage in its ideal character, it opens the way for its profanation and abuse as the case stands in South American countries under Roman Catholic control.

An ironclad, inexorable law, without any possible exception, would place the innocent husband or wife at the mercy of wicked and immoral companions without relief or remedy except death itself. This would degrade the sanctity of marriage instead of exalting it into the holiest of human relations. For that one great crime which confounds the mystery of human life and destroys the identity of the family itself, and violates the law of inheritance, for the crime of fornication, or adultery, the Saviour allows the absolute dissolution of the marriage bond in behalf of the innocent party. And certainly this is a wise and merciful provision. It sets a premium upon chastity and fidelity, upon that mutual affection and singleness of purpose which are the noblest characteristics of holy matrimony. Adultery involves perjury of the worst kind, because it is a wilful and horrible violation of the marriage vow which binds to forsake all others and cleave to the wedded companion only so long as they both shall live. It profanes the temple of humanity in the holy of holies,

where the highest interests of society, in Church and State, demand that it should be kept pure and spotless. Hence it is a crime that justifies divorce in behalf of the injured husband or wife. But when this is said, about all is said that can be said from the Christian standpoint in behalf of absolute divorce. As Meyer and most other commentators say, the mention of one exceptional ground of divorce by our Saviour excludes every other ground or pretext. Some theologians belonging to State churches have striven to lower the divine standard, but Scriptural divorce can only be allowed because of adultery or fornication as set forth by our Saviour (Matt. 5 and 19).

The effort to weaken or modify this rule of our Saviour by quoting what St. Paul has said at I. Cor. 7: 15, etc., has frequently been made by advocates of lax divorce legislation. "If the unbelieving depart, let him depart. A brother or a sister is not under bondage in such cases; but God hath called us unto peace." But the context shows that the separation here spoken of by the Apostle is one from bed and board and not an absolute dissolution of the marriage bond itself. When an unbeliever refuses to live in wedlock with a believer the latter is to suffer separation rather than renounce allegiance to the Lord and sacrifice religious convictions. But so long as the departing unbeliever does not renounce the marriage relation itself by marrying another or by committing adultery the believer must wait patiently and seek by reasonable Christian methods to be reconciled again to the estranged companion of former days. Believers of either sex are not under bondage to the marriage tie in such sense as to be at the mercy of cruel and infidel companions without protection or relief. Their spiritual and everlasting interests are paramount and rather than sacrifice these they may remain in a state of separation in hope of winning the departing one back not only to marriage obligations, but winning such to the cause of Christ and thus promoting their salvation. This is his own individual advice in the peculiar situation of mixed matrimonial unions existing between believers and unbelievers in the early days of Christianity, when one of the parties became converted

to Christ and the other remained in heathenish unbelief and idolatry. But in regard to the marriage bond itself the rule is laid down here, as well as Romans 7: 2, etc., by St. Paul, that it is indissoluble except by death, in accordance with the command and principles laid down by our blessed Lord already set forth. Hence, in the immediate context St. Paul exclaims: "Unto the married I command, yet not I but the Lord: Let not the wife depart from her husband. But and if she depart, let her remain unmarried or be reconciled to her husband and let not the husband put away his wife."

If for any cause short of adultery, separation is necessary, it must not be absolute in the form of a dissolution of the marriage bond itself, but only a separation from bed and board in hope of future reconciliation. But for a Christian believer to enter into matrimonial relations with an infidel or heathen unbeliever was a moral monstrosity not to be countenanced by the followers of the Lord Jesus Christ. Such a union is not marriage in the true sense but an unequal combination of heterogeneous creatures like the yoking of an ox and an ass together, forbidden by the law of Moses. But when once the matrimonial relation was formed even with an unbeliever, whether before or after conversion it was binding within the limitations already stated by our Lord in condemning the loose and unscriptural views of the degenerate and carnal-minded Pharisees.

Hence there is no conflict or discrepancy between the teachings of St. Paul and our Saviour in regard to marriage and divorce, but on the contrary they complete and confirm each other on these as on all other important subjects. The analogy of the truth would compel us to hold such a position even if the harmony was less apparent on the face of the record. The Apostle commends marriage as a high and honorable estate and compares it to the mystical union subsisting between Christ and His Church, The wife is to reverence and submit herself to her husband as the head of the family, as it is fit in the Lord, and husbands are to love their wives and be not bitter against them, yea to love them "even as Christ also loved the Church and gave Himself for it."

Where such mutual affection, fidelity and esteem exist, marriage will be indeed an holy estate, the sacred bond and foundation of the family, which is the unit of society, the truest type of Church and State. In no other form can the divine command be obeyed "Be fruitful and multiply and replenish the earth" so as to put a God-fearing generation in possession of the footstool of the Almighty and bring the children of men into obedience to the maker of their bodies and Father of their spirits.

Nations have been strong, stable and prosperous in proportion to their estimate of marriage and their opposition to divorce on trivial grounds. No people ever excelled the ancient Spartans in virility and self-sacrificing devotion to the public welfare. Thermopylæ recalls their exalted patriotism and deathless valor as an inspiration for all ages. Marriage among the Spartans was looked upon as a sacred duty which a man owed to his country no less than to himself and every citizen was obliged to marry by legal penalties.

A high premium was set upon marriage in the better days of the old Roman Republic. Taxation was lessened in proportion to the number of children belonging to families and a bounty given when the number was unusually large. The sanctity of marriage was carefully guarded and from this arose the lofty character of the ancient Roman matron. Lucretia and Cornelia, the mother of the Gracchi, stood for as much in Roman history as the greatest military chieftains. The chastity and frugality of the women had its counterpart in the fortitude and heroic devotion of the men in the glorious days of the Commonwealth when to be a Roman was greater than a king. Centuries elapsed before a single divorce was granted.

Frequency of divorce for trivial causes at a later age went hand in hand, both as cause and effect, with the decay of public and private virtue. Profligacy and licentiousness increased at an alarming rate and the republic soon perished. The barbaric tribes of the North, our Teutonic ancestors, who revered the marriage relation speedily overwhelmed the mistress of the world when the old Roman virtue and valor had given place to immorality and marital infidelity in degenerate days of the empire.

The history of other nations in like manner confirms the truth of the divine record. Righteousness (such as the Bible enjoins) exalteth a nation, but sin is the reproach and ruin of any people. As marriage is the most sacred and enduring bond of society and healthy well-regulated families are the life-blood of Church and State, no patriot or Christian can be indifferent to questions affecting the sanctity of marriage. If the fountain of human life and of social order itself be poisoned or polluted, the stream of humanity will be corrupt and full of abominations. As is the fountain, so is the stream. As is the tree, so is the fruit. A corrupt tree cannot yield good fruit, nor can a bitter fountain send forth sweet waters. When the foundations are destroyed what can the righteous do?

The remedy is plain and simple. Christian people who love their God and their country must raise up a standard against the iniquitous divorce system which disgraces the majority of our American Commonwealths, and do all in their power to make legislation, in Church and State, conform to the teachings of the Lord Jesus Christ on the subject of marriage and divorce. Absolute divorce should never be granted except for the cause of adultery and fornication, and then only the innocent party should be released from the marriage obligation. The party adjudged guilty in divorce cases should be severely punished by imprisonment as well as fines. This would prevent the collusion and connivance of unprincipled persons who mutually desire to have the marriage bond dissolved in order that they may contract new alliances with impunity. Immorality of one or the other party is everywhere reckoned a valid ground of divorce, but unless the immorality itself be punished by severe penalties and no resulting advantage be allowed to accrue to the guilty offender, divorce legislation frequently encourages immorality on the part of those anxious to obtain release from the marriage obligation. Thus, the desire to attain divorce becomes the pretext for immoral conduct and one wrong is done to justify or achieve another under legal forms. If adultery were punishable with death, as under the Mosaic law, full and final divorce or separation would come

as a necessary consequence to the relief of the innocent instead of a reward for the guilty as the laws of many States of this Union now virtually make it. Of course, I do not advocate the death penalty, but laws ought never to set a premium upon vice. Divorce legislation everywhere needs fundamental reconstruction on this vital point, so as to prove a terror to evil-doers and a praise to them that do well.

In addition to absolute divorce or dissolution of the marriage bond itself, St. Paul and civil governments generally throughout the world recognize limited divorce or separation "*a mensa et thoro*"—from bed and board. Under this head should come every case not based on the scriptural ground of adultery. Excessive cruelty, wilful desertion, habitual drunkenness, religious persecution, culpable failure to provide for the wants of the family, etc., may justify such separation, but in every case where it is possible the offender ought to be punished by the strong arm of the civil law.

The time is at hand when the commonwealth should demand some security for the fulfillment of marriage obligations before giving its sanction to their formation; at least, so far as to guarantee the temporal support of the household on the part of him who aspires to be head of the family. Hastily formed and injudicious marriages are a fruitful source of divorces. At the same time reasonably early marriages ought to be encouraged on the part of all who are in a position to gain a respectable living. It may be said that the writer ought to have practiced as he preaches. He should not have waited until he was a bachelor of thirty-two before taking unto himself an helpmeet and better half. I admit the justice of the imputation, but plead in extenuation the exigencies of missionary life. Few would venture to launch their frail bark on the sea of matrimony with a salary of four hundred dollars a year in an expensive city, and with only fifty dollars to start with. But that was what the writer finally did. Not only so, but ten years of arduous frontier missionary service beyond the Mississippi were given to the Church after marriage at a salary of three hundred and fifty dollars per year

after house rent was paid. A horse and buggy had to be kept also on this amount. And yet with this meagre income, generally paid long after it was due, we lived comfortably, and were able to lay something by for a rainy day. I say these things not in the way of boasting but to give a practical demonstration to all, and especially to young ministers in favor of marrying at the earliest practicable date, provided, of course, they marry in the Lord, frugal and sensible wives.

"Marry for love and work for riches" is a good old saying. There is a spice of romance, mingled with trust in Providence, to beautify and bless such marriages, and happy are the people where sentiments and customs of this kind prevail. But right here is where the trouble begins. The majority of young people imagine that they ought to begin where their parents or grandparents leave off. They are not willing to walk in the frugal ways of their honored and God-fearing ancestors. Making haste to get rich they err from the faith and pierce themselves through with many sorrows. They are ambitious to cope with wealthy neighbors in maintaining large and expensive establishments, which are a burden and a curse rather than something to be desired by people of moderate income. In their desperation they resort to speculative methods, they assume unwarranted risks, they fall into temptation and a snare, and many foolish and hurtful lusts, which drown men in destruction and perdition. Instead of early marriages and large families of well-trained children, a glorious heritage from the Lord, the tendency of these extravagant views is in the direction of late marriages and few, if any, children. This is neither patriotic nor Christian. The horrible brood of divorces as well as the army of defaulters is largely replenished from this class of society. Failing to reach or realize their false ideal of fashionable life, discord and crimination take the place of that domestic contentment and affectionate coöperation which characterize every genuine Christian home.

Desertion, divorce, suicide, the dissolution and ruination of households are the natural outcome of this order of things. But such, alas! is the tendency of a large part of modern society.

This is a question that concerns every friend of humanity. Self-preservation demands that civil governments shall enact legislation in accordance with Christian principles of marriage and morality. Where these principles are disregarded and violated, divorces increase at an alarming rate. Where the sanctity of marriage is not carefully guarded and trivial grounds of separation are multiplied on the statute book, there will be a corresponding increase in the number of divorces and all the abominable train of evils that follow in their wake.

Three hundred and twenty-eight thousand, seven hundred and sixteen divorces were reported in the United States from 1867 to 1886 inclusive, or a period of twenty years, although the statistics are not complete! The misery and crime involved in the disruption of so many marriage bonds and domestic ties, who can estimate? And latest statistics for 1900 show an alarming increase in the evil. Baltimore papers, in the latter part of January, report a large increase of divorces in that city during the previous year as compared with marriages. The number throughout the United States among the non-Catholic population has increased from 16,435 to 75,000 per year since 1886, *i. e.* is nearly five times as great. The saddest and most alarming feature of the deplorable divorce record is the fact that divorces in a majority of States are increasing in a ratio far greater than population itself. While the increase of population in 1886 was 60 per cent. above what it was in 1867, the increase in divorces was 156.9 per cent. more than in 1867. In the latter half of those 20 years the increase was 69 per cent. greater than during the previous ten years. The statistics for 1900 when complete will show a still worse condition during the past decade. The Northern States make a worse showing than the Southern at the beginning of this period (from 1867 to 1886), but because of the increase of loose and unscriptural regulations in their divorce legislation and the influx of a less conservative population, the old Slave States are rapidly gaining a bad preëminence over their Northern sisters. From 1870 to 1880 population increased 20 per cent. in Northern States east of the Mississippi. During the last five years of that

period, *i. e.*, from 1875 to 1880, the divorces were 64 per cent. more than during the previous five years.

In the Southern States, while population increased 33 per cent. between 1870 and 1880, the divorces increased at the fearful rate of 228 per cent. In the States and Territories west of the Mississippi there was an increase of 255 per cent. in the number of divorces during the last five years of this twenty-year period, as compared with the first five years, but population increased 84 per cent. during the census decade. It used to be said that although it might be hard to get a drink in Maine it was easy to get a divorce. It is a notable and instructive fact that in Maine, Vermont, Connecticut and Michigan divorces were fewer in 1886 than in 1867, and this decrease was the result of improved divorce legislation in those States, secured through the efforts of the National Divorce Reform League and its friends in their respective States. In several other States the rate of increase has also been checked by better legislation. As a rule, also, there are twice as many divorces in cities of the worst class, including their adjacent county, than in the rest of the State in proportion to the number of married couples. For instance, Indianapolis and the county to which it belongs had one divorce to every 128 married couples during 1880, and the State of Indiana one to 278 couples. Cleveland, Ohio, had one divorce to 221 married couples, and the State one to 409; Milwaukee one to 251, and Wisconsin one to 516. New England States and communities are almost as bad as the new States and Territories of the far West, where society is in a rather disorganized condition. Formerly some northeastern States had one divorce to every eight marriages. And this in spite of the fact that the Irish Catholics and French Canadians are religiously opposed to divorce and pride themselves on early marriages and large families, and these form a large and increasing part of the population. One French Canadian family is as large as four or five native American New England families. Their priests teach that God will bring to an end any nation that contains so many childless homes but will exalt the people who obey His laws in regard to

marriage and the family. On this point too they are right. Out of the 328,716 divorces granted during the twenty years from 1867 to 1886, only 20 per cent. were for adultery or on Scriptural grounds, 16 per cent. were for cruelty, 38 for desertion and only 4 per cent. for drunkenness, etc. From this it appears that Prohibition even if successful would not be a panacea for the direst ills of society. Instead of granting absolute divorce from the marriage bond four-fifths of this vast number should have been limited divorce or separation "a mensa et thoro," *i. e.*, from bed and board or no legal separation at all. The average length of married life before divorce is secured is about ten years and contrary to the opinion of many 80 per cent. of all divorces obtained in the United States during the specified twenty years were granted by the very States in which the parties had been married.

Hence uniform legislation by Congress on the basis of a constitutional amendment would not furnish a tithe of the relief expected in many quarters. South Carolina allows no divorce whatever and consequently would be wronged by a national law allowing divorce for several causes as such a law by consensus of opinion would naturally do. New York only allows one cause of absolute divorce whilst Pennsylvania allows ten. And yet the Keystone ordinance declares that "all marriages not forbidden by the laws of God shall be encouraged." Surely the reverse is true that all divorces forbidden by the law of God shall be discouraged. New Jersey and two or three other States only recognize two or three causes of absolute divorce. Statistics show corresponding decrease in the number of divorces in proportion to population as laws are more stringent. In twenty years the Empire State only had 15,355 divorces, while Illinois had 36,072 and Indiana 25,193 and Ohio 26,857.

New York has appointed a commission of three persons to solicit coöperation of other States and Territories in passing uniform laws on the subject of marriage and divorce. This seems preferable to a constitutional amendment delegating the authority to Congress. The general government should be con-

fined to as few objects of legislation as possible and, as a rule, each State can manage its own internal and domestic affairs better than any outside parties. But no matter what statesmen and politicians may do or propose to do the Church of Jesus Christ owes a duty to herself and to society in upholding the sanctity of marriage and forbidding divorces by her members on unscriptural grounds. Legislation is educational and helps to form the thought and life of society. It is lamentable to witness the ignorance, indifference or cringing subserviency manifested by many ministers of the Gospel in dealing with cases of unscriptural divorce. The result is that moral barriers of society are being overthrown. Three leading candidates for U. S. Senator now being voted for by one of our State Legislatures are divorced or married to divorced women. Many seem to think that the Church dare not go behind the decrees of the State in such matters. Divorced persons are to be remarried and discipline not enforced because forsooth the State has decreed the separation and it would be disloyalty to Cæsar not to sanction his decrees! The writer had some very interesting but rather expensive experience in this line nearly thirty years ago when at the earnest request of worthy brethren in the State of Illinois he undertook to call a minister of the Reformed Church to account for allowing his wife to get a divorce from him without protest and then marrying a woman divorced from her husband on unscriptural grounds.

Such an aggravated case would seem to challenge immediate and decisive attention on the part of the judicatories of the church and no right-minded person would suppose that there could be any difference of opinion as to the proper course to be pursued. And yet after overcoming almost insurmountable obstacles in our efforts to get positive action on the part of a Western Classis our efforts were nullified by the District Synod virtually restoring the deposed minister without a constitutional adjudication of his case. The General Synod at Cincinnati did itself the credit of sustaining the original action of the Classis by setting aside the wrong action of the District Synod. But by this time the friends of the divorced minister in the Classis had succeeded in sup-

plying several vacant charges with sympathizing young pastors who had the audacity and presumption to undertake to set aside and revoke the action of General Synod itself by restoring the deposed man again to the ministerial office. This action of Classis was ultimately reversed and rebuked by the District Synod. But before a full and final settlement of the case was reached the writer was obliged to travel over 3,500 miles at great personal expense and inconvenience and be subject to a vast amount of abuse and persecution. An effort was then made to tone up the sentiment of the church by securing a deliverance from General Synod as regards the teaching of the New Testament on the subject of divorce. In response to our overture the matter was referred to a special committee by the General Synod at Cincinnati who brought in an evasive and non-committal report amid the bustle and confusion of adjournment.

An effort which I made to amend the report by declaring adultery or fornication the only ground of divorce sanctioned by our Saviour and the Apostles failed by less than half a dozen votes. The report of the committee was aptly compared to the Irishman's boiled watermelon, *i. e.*, a great big nothing.

At the next meeting of General Synod in Fort Wayne, 1875, overtures came up from the Classes of Iowa, Maryland and Eastern Pennsylvania, requesting General Synod to give a positive and Scriptural deliverance on the subject of divorce, but the committee appointed to consider the subject claimed not to have sufficient time to prepare a report that would do adequate justice to the case. However, until a fuller report could be prepared for the consideration of the next General Synod, it was resolved, in response to the overtures of the Classes, that the marriage bond is indissoluble except by natural death, and the various pastors and judicatories of the Reformed Church were directed to give no validity in their spiritual discipline to any divorce except such as has been granted upon the ground of adultery. The committee was continued, with instructions to report in full three years hence.

At the next meeting of General Synod, in Lancaster, Pa.,

1878, the chairman of the committee was absent in Europe and failed to send in his expected elaborate report. After some cavalier remarks tending to make light of the divorce question, a certain Doctor moved that the Committee on Divorce be discharged. His motion was adopted, and since then General Synod has given no attention to divorce legislation.

By appointment of the Synod of the Potomac at Hanover, Pa., the writer of this article prepared a somewhat elaborate report on the divorce question, which was submitted and earnestly discussed at the meeting of Synod a year later in Chambersburg, 1885. The substance of the historical and Scriptural argument covering three printed pages of the minutes was embodied in four resolutions, as follows:

(1) *Resolved*, That the alarming increase of the number of divorces, granted by the civil courts on unscriptural grounds, is an evil that strikes at the very foundation of society.

(2) *Resolved*, That this Synod calls the solemn attention of our people to the requirements of God's word, which recognizes adultery alone as a valid ground of divorce.

(3) *Resolved* further, In cases of absolute divorce granted on the Scriptural ground of adultery, only the innocent party is entitled to enter anew upon marriage relations.

(4) *Resolved*, That our pastors be directed to govern themselves accordingly in performing marriage ceremonies and our consistories in exercising discipline.

The body of the report and the first three resolutions were adopted without much opposition but the fourth resolution above (given as third in the report) was rejected by a vote of 74 to 27 on a call for the yeas and nays by the writer. This was a virtual repudiation of the provisional action of General Synod at Fort Wayne which directs pastors and judicatories to give no validity to any divorce in their spiritual discipline except such as has been granted on the ground of adultery. As this was the enacting clause and really the practical part of the entire deliverance of the Potomac Synod without which all that preceded it was a nullity, the writer felt that no progress had been made except to ascertain the fact that many brethren had very confused notions

or lacked the courage of their convictions on the divorce question. Like the Maine politician no matter how much they might favor Prohibitory legislation in theory they were opposed to its practicrl enforcement. They approved of the matter heartily in the abstract but not in the concrete. Statesmen and political philanthropists frequently occupy higher ground on the marriage and divorce question than ministers of the Gospel. Hon. Wm. J. Baer, as a member of the Pennsylvania Constitutional Convention earnestly and eloquently advocated the limitation of absolute divorce to the sole ground of adultery. Governor Pattison advocated legislation to this effect in one of his messages to the Pennsylvania Legislature.

It is high time that the Church of Christ should lift up a standard against this monster iniquity, which is sapping the very foundations of society—that the Bride of the Lamb should emphasize the teachings of the Heavenly Bridegroom on the marriage and divorce questions. For Christian patriots this seem to be the supreme duty of the hour. No halting, half-hearted, vacillating course will avail. On no social problem does Christ speak words so direct and positive as on the matter of the family and divorce. Many pastors and people imagine that the decrees of the civil courts are binding in matters of spiritual discipline. The writer has been threatened with prosecution and dire penalties for claiming that persons who married again after being unscripturally divorced were guilty of adultery according to our Saviour's teachings. No civil court in the United States dare interfere in matters of spiritual discipline when the Church proceeds according to rules based on the teachings of God's Word. And even if they would dare to violate that principle of American Magna Charta, every true-hearted Christian would respond, "We must obey God rather than man."

A little more practical experience illustrating the demoralizing tendency of equivocal action by our ecclesiastical courts on the divorce question must be given before I conclude this paper. Not long after the inconsistent deliverance of the Chambersburg Synod, heretofore quoted, the writer was informed that a young

lady member of his pastoral charge was receiving marked attentions from a very dissipated married man, whose wife had left him because of cruel treatment, etc., and who had applied for a divorce from her on ground of desertion.

In company with an elder I went to the home of the young lady and in the presence of the widowed mother pointed out the danger and wickedness of her conduct, telling her that even if the man would get the divorce by default of his wife, who held to the Dunkards and was opposed to litigation, to appear against him in order to secure a speedy release from his cruelty, etc., she as a Christian woman would have no right to marry him because the divorce would be granted on unscriptural grounds. She set our admonition at defiance and was married to him immediately after the divorce was granted by default of his wife to appear against him. The drunken fellow had even the audacity to bring the young lady to the parsonage to try to convince me that I ought to perform the marriage ceremony as soon as the decree of divorce was obtained. But what I indignantly refused to do he had no trouble to get done by another Reformed pastor. Of course we suspended the contumacious woman, but here again our authority was nullified by another Reformed pastor who received her and her dissipated husband on renewal of profession without paying any regard to her suspension by our spiritual council or the fact that she had willfully married a man who had obtained his divorce by default on unscriptural grounds.

When the attention of the Classis was called to the matter still another Reformed pastor made a speech trying to justify the breach of discipline and violation of principles of Christian fellowship because the offending pastor was trying to save souls and hence ought not to be too particular in inquiring into previous moral delinquencies of applicants. The writer could but reply "The salvation of souls goes to the dogs when fundamental principles of Christian morality are trampled under foot in this manner."

The writer has observed in his extensive experience, East and West, that no class of people are so indifferent in upholding

or lacked the courage of their convictions on the divorce question. Like the Maine politician no matter how much they might favor Prohibitory legislation in theory they were opposed to its practicrl enforcement. They approved of the matter heartily in the abstract but not in the concrete. Statesmen and political philanthropists frequently occupy higher ground on the marriage and divorce question than ministers of the Gospel. Hon. Wm. J. Baer, as a member of the Pennsylvania Constitutional Convention earnestly and eloquently advocated the limitation of absolute divorce to the sole ground of adultery. Governor Pattison advocated legislation to this effect in one of his messages to the Pennsylvania Legislature.

It is high time that the Church of Christ should lift up a standard against this monster iniquity, which is sapping the very foundations of society—that the Bride of the Lamb should emphasize the teachings of the Heavenly Bridegroom on the marriage and divorce questions. For Christian patriots this seem to be the supreme duty of the hour. No halting, half-hearted, vacillating course will avail. On no social problem does Christ speak words so direct and positive as on the matter of the family and divorce. Many pastors and people imagine that the decrees of the civil courts are binding in matters of spiritual discipline. The writer has been threatened with prosecution and dire penalties for claiming that persons who married again after being unscripturally divorced were guilty of adultery according to our Saviour's teachings. No civil court in the United States dare interfere in matters of spiritual discipline when the Church proceeds according to rules based on the teachings of God's Word. And even if they would dare to violate that principle of American Magna Charta, every true-hearted Christian would respond, "We must obey God rather than man."

A little more practical experience illustrating the demoralizing tendency of equivocal action by our ecclesiastical courts on the divorce question must be given before I conclude this paper. Not long after the inconsistent deliverance of the Chambersburg Synod, heretofore quoted, the writer was informed that a young

lady member of his pastoral charge was receiving marked attentions from a very dissipated married man, whose wife had left him because of cruel treatment, etc., and who had applied for a divorce from her on ground of desertion.

In company with an elder I went to the home of the young lady and in the presence of the widowed mother pointed out the danger and wickedness of her conduct, telling her that even if the man would get the divorce by default of his wife, who held to the Dunkards and was opposed to litigation, to appear against him in order to secure a speedy release from his cruelty, etc., she as a Christian woman would have no right to marry him because the divorce would be granted on unscriptural grounds. She set our admonition at defiance and was married to him immediately after the divorce was granted by default of his wife to appear against him. The drunken fellow had even the audacity to bring the young lady to the parsonage to try to convince me that I ought to perform the marriage ceremony as soon as the decree of divorce was obtained. But what I indignantly refused to do he had no trouble to get done by another Reformed pastor. Of course we suspended the contumacious woman, but here again our authority was nullified by another Reformed pastor who received her and her dissipated husband on renewal of profession without paying any regard to her suspension by our spiritual council or the fact that she had willfully married a man who had obtained his divorce by default on unscriptural grounds.

When the attention of the Classis was called to the matter still another Reformed pastor made a speech trying to justify the breach of discipline and violation of principles of Christian fellowship because the offending pastor was trying to save souls and hence ought not to be too particular in inquiring into previous moral delinquencies of applicants. The writer could but reply "The salvation of souls goes to the dogs when fundamental principles of Christian morality are trampled under foot in this manner."

The writer has observed in his extensive experience, East and West, that no class of people are so indifferent in upholding

scriptural principles of marriage and divorce as the advocates of unchurchly systems of revivalistic religion. Here, as in other matters, they will strain at a gnat and swallow a camel. Merely temporary, local or personal considerations are allowed to override eternal and immutable principles. The minister who was deposed after so long a struggle heretofore described, was received with open arms by the United Brethren and went ahead preaching as before in defiance of his deposition and excommunication by the Reformed Church.

To sum up the situation, as legislative records confront us, the deliverance of our General Synod at Fort Wayne, which agrees with its previous decision in the concrete case of Rev. Henry Knepper at Cincinnati, must be regarded as authoritative and regulative by all loyal members and judicatories of the Reformed Church. That deliverance and that decision recognizes adultery or fornication alone as a valid ground of divorce, in the exercise of spiritual discipline. Until that regulation is legally changed by General Synod it must be strictly observed by our people in church courts, and it is not at all likely that the scriptural position therein set forth will ever be lowered or repealed by any future deliverance of General Synod. It behooves us as patriotic citizens of this great Republic, as well as faithful members of the Reformed Church, to help forward the movement to reform divorce legislation wherever needed in church or State. We should join heart and hand with public-spirited Christians everywhere in earnest efforts to reconstruct the disjointed foundations of society on the normal basis of Christian marriage and the Christian family. Thus shall we best subserve the truest interests of the Commonwealth.

VIII.

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT.

Reflections on the Death of the Queen.

The death of Queen Victoria was an event which made a profound impression upon the civilized world. This impression was not due to the event being unexpected. The queen's age and state of health made it certain that her departure could not be very far off, and hence nobody was surprised when it took place. Still the announcement of it produced something of a mental shock, wherever it was received. Men stopped to think and to reflect, not merely upon the vanity of sublunary things in general, but especially upon the fact that, no matter how high men and women may be placed in life, they must all meet the common end which is appointed to all flesh. The queen, indeed, had reached more than the fourscore years which form the ordinary limit of human life. Indeed her long reign of sixty-four years was one of the circumstances which made it so difficult for most people at once to reconcile themselves to the fact that she was no more. Her name was familiar to everbody. In fact it was a household word wherever the English tongue is spoken. Two generations of men grew up during the continuance of her reign. Comparatively few men now living had been born when Victoria was crowned Queen of England. Very few of us have ever known England otherwise than in connection with the name of Queen Victoria. Hence it is somewhat difficult for us now to reconcile ourselves to the change. To part with so familiar a name, although few of us ever saw the person to whom it belonged, creates something of an uneasy sensation; and it will be a long time before the name of Edward the Seventh shall sound as familiar as did that of Queen Victoria, even if he should prove himself to be not unworthy of so illustrious a mother.

But another circumstance which invests the queen's death with

interest is the fact that her reign was not merely the longest in history, but that it covered a period of time which must be recognized as one of the most important in the world's annals. This period will be known hereafter, especially in England, as the *Victorian age;* and to this age Englishmen will ever point as the brightest period in their history. To be sure Victoria did not make the age in which she lived. We may say rather that the age made her; and yet she was a true and worthy exponent of the age, and her name will ever be connected with it as its most distinguishing mark. But the Victorian age belongs not merely to England, or to Englishmen. It belongs to the people of all lands—it belongs to the world. It is the age in which the greatest progress has been made in the arts of life the world over. When Victoria was crowned queen of England, England was not the England of the present day. England's reigning spirit and life at that time were still essentially those of the eighteenth century. Her arts and industry were the products of the past. And the same is true of other countries. The working of railroads, steam navigation, and the application of machinery to industry were still in their infancy. In science the advance has been most marked during this Victorian age; but literature, too, and poetry, and philosophy, and theology have been cultivated to an extent and with a degree of freedom previously unknown. In science this age has produced Darwin, and Huxley, and Spencer, whose names, whatever may be thought of some of their theories, will shine with splendor on the pages of history. In literature we have had Charles Dickens and George Eliot; in poetry, Browning and Tennyson; and in philosophy and theology the names are so numerous and weighty that it would be invidious to make any selections. But the chief thing to be said is that theology as well as science have been completely reborn and made new during the period of Victoria's reign. And this has been the result, not of any violent revolution, but of a quiet and gradual evolution. But what has occurred in the realm of the intellectual life, has occurred also in the realm of the physical life. The increase in the physical comforts of life has been very great; and this has af-

fected not merely the higher classes of society, but all classes. Indeed it may not be too much to say that the condition of the middle and lower classes has improved comparatively more than that of the opulent, although there may still be much reason for discontent. In this connection the fact should be remembered that sociology, the science of social welfare, has been the creation entirely of the Victorian age. How much of this advancement of the life of the modern world may have been due to the social condition of modern England and to the influence of England's queen, we would not presume to say. But we are sure that it belonged to the period during which she reigned; and that the history of Queen Victoria can not be written without due consideration of the facts and circumstances to which we have here but briefly referred.

But the thing that people just now speak of with most interest and satisfaction is the queen's private character. Her character of woman, wife and mother is of more worth to the English people, and to the world, than her character of sovereign. During the sixty-four years of her reign, while she lived in the full glare of publicity, her name was never touched by the breath of scandal. She was never accused of bribing a legislator, or of selling the patronage of the government. As a woman and wife she lived in such way as to be above all suspicion. To be sure it may be said that that was just as it ought to have been; and that it is no particular credit to any woman to say of her that she is honest and virtuous, for this is just what every woman ought to be. And, besides, Victoria had special motives for being honest and virtuous. She was raised above all want; she was married early in life; she had a good and loyal husband; and she was the mother of nine children. How utterly inexcusable, then, would she have been, had she been otherwise than she was? This is all very true from the standpoint of ethics. But how is it from the standpoint of daily observation? Is it a common thing in history? Of how many women in Europe, living during the same period of time, and in the same conditions of publicity, could it be said that their names were never

connected with any scandal either civic or social? The name of Queen Victoria unsullied by anything unbecoming a woman, is an inheritance to her people of more value than conquered lands, or streams of foreign tribute flowing into their exchequer. Queen Victoria was an example of a woman to women, of a wife to wives, and of a mother to mothers. She was a *true* woman, wife and mother. She discharged the functions of motherhood, for instance, in a way that should shame many a woman who occupies no throne and wears no crown.

This universally human and womanly side of the queen's character is the side that is most emphasized just now, and perhaps always will be. The queen was no great genius of any sort. She was not an artist, or author, or scholar. And we do not think that she was a great diplomatist. On this side she had no claim to fame. But she was a woman of a large amount of common sense, of honest purpose, and of good intentions, who had by dint of education and much training been made into a respectable head of the government. On this side of common humanity and womanhood her fame is secure. But in the case of a sovereign, or ruler, private character is not the only criterion by which the worth of the person must be determined. In order to a complete estimate of Victoria's character, then, the *queen* must be taken into consideration as well as the *woman*. We have a most mischievous habit in this country of distinguishing between public and private character in the same person. We seem to think that a man may be morally a good *man*, but a bad *politician* or *statesman*. A man may be loyal as a husband, tender and loving as a father, and kind as a neighbor; but he may be slippery as a politician—ready to sell his vote in the Legislature, or to use his money for corrupting the government. What shall we say of such a one? Shall we say that he is a good man, or that he is a bad man, or that he is partly good and partly bad—good as a *man*, bad as a *politician?* We may, indeed, make such a distinction in our thinking; but how is it with the concrete person which forms the object of our thinking? Can that be divided in the same way? There is a story of a duke who held the

office of bishop, and who was in the habit of using profane language. On being admonished that it was not becoming in a bishop to swear, he replied that he did not swear as *bishop* but as *duke*. But his monitor asked, "When the devil comes to get the duke, what will then become of the bishop?" No, we cannot allow such a distinction. The man who is dishonest in public life—who would sell his vote, or influence, or official trust, for money or any other consideration, is a bad man, no matter what may be his conduct as husband, or father, or neighbor. And this standard of judgment must be applied to the queen as well as to other people. Her character must be judged by her public acts, and by the character of her government, no less than by her private life. We do not forget, of course, that there is an essential difference, so far as official power and responsibility are concerned, between a British sovereign and an American chief magistrate. An American president is personally responsible for the character of his cabinet and for the policy of his administration, for he appoints the one and shapes the other. Not so a British sovereign. A British sovereign is in some sense merely the organ through which the will of the nation as represented in Parliament gives expression to itself; and hence it might seem as if the sovereign's responsibility for the policy of the government were only that of a single unit of the nation. And yet there are many ways in which the sovereign, even in England, can influence and direct the national will, and modify its execution. The sovereign, therefore, is not without a large degree of responsibility; and the manner in which this responsibility is accepted and borne must be taken into consideration in estimating the sovereign's character.

What, then, was the character of *Queen* Victoria, that is, her character not as *woman*, but as *queen?* This can be determined only from the general character and policy of the British government during the period of her reign; for no radical difference between the queen and the government can be supposed to have existed. And judged from this side of her character it may be feared that the splendor of the queen's name will hereafter be

much dimmed. For the conduct and policy of the British government during the last sixty years have certainly not always been such as a Christian moralist could commend, nor such as history will hereafter approve. It may be said, of course, that for this the queen was but remotely and to a very limited extent responsible; and in favor of this judgment appeal may be made, in the first place, to the constitutional limitation of the British sovereign, to which we have already referred, and, in the second place, to the fact that the queen was a woman and not a man. Being a woman, she had the mind and heart of a woman; but the mind and heart of a woman are not well fitted to contend successfully with men in cabinets; and sovereignty is, therefore, for a woman rather a misfortune than a fortune. Of much that was done by the British government during the sixty-four years of her reign the queen may not herself have personally approved; but she may have felt herself powerless to control her cabinets and parliaments. Had she been a man instead of a woman, with the disposition with which she has usually been credited, much might have been different from what it was. It is usually supposed that during our civil war the queen was rather friendly to our government, while the English government was of a decidedly opposite disposition. This shows how the queen might be in one state of mind and her government in another. And here, instead of recognizing merely a weakness in the character of the queen, we are bound to recognize a weakness in the English constitution. We believe that the old Salic law of the Franks, which excluded females from the throne, was a good law; but so long as the throne is treated as a hereditary possession, like a piece of land, or a herd of cattle, so long it will not be possible to keep women from inheriting it. We believe, however, that this whole notion of hereditary sovereignty is in conflict with the true conception of the nature of government. We hold that the doctrine announced in our Declaration of Independence is thoroughly true, that the powers of government are derived from the consent of the governed. But in that case they cannot be hereditary in a particular family; and the notion of kings reign-

ing by "the grace of God" must be regarded as an exploded superstition. But that superstition is still embodied in the British constitution, however largely it may have dropped out of the minds of the British people; and whoever accepts the government on the conditions of the constitution, must be supposed, to some extent at least, to accept responsibility for its acts. The enormous emoluments and privileges which belong to the office must not be supposed to be granted merely for the purpose of having a figure head without any real duties or responsibilities.

How, then, did Queen Victoria discharge her duties and bear her responsibilities; and what was the general character of her government? Doubtless there was much in her government that was good and praiseworthy. In its domestic policy it generally looked to the real improvement of the conditions of the English people. The rights and privileges of the people were much increased. Concession after concession was wrested from the nobility. The elective franchise was extended to the masses of the people. A public school system was adopted and provision made for the education of the children of all classes. In fact such was the policy, or at least conduct, of the queen's government that England has become, next to the United States, the most democratic country in the world. And with this liberal, popular policy the queen is believed to have been in thorough accord. In the foreign policy of the queen's government also there was much that was good and noble, and much that tended at least to the material benefit of the British people. But there were also some things that were decidedly ignoble, and that could not be defended from the standpoint of morality; and for these the queen, as well as her advisers, must bear her share of responsibilty. There was, for instance, in the early part of her reign, the "opium war" waged against China, undertaken for the benefit of English merchants, which has brought unspeakable misery upon the Chinese people, and greatly increased the difficulty of their Christianization. That was, to say the least, not a noble enterprise; and whether approved by the queen and her noble consort or not, she can not be wholly absolved from the responsibility of it. The

Crimean War, entered into by the English government at the instance of Louis Napoleon, in order to bolster up the rotten concern of the Turkish Empire, was nothing short of a national crime, from which England derived neither profit nor glory. Aside from all questions of morality, that war was for England about as fruitless an enterprise as was the charge of the "light brigade," which may be regarded as a fitting symbol of the whole movement. It was grand, but it served no good purpose.

But England's entire policy with reference to Turkey, during Victoria's reign, was such as ought to bring the blush of shame to the cheeks of every honest and self-respecting Englishman. The fact that this policy was adopted from fear or jealousy of Russia can not change men's judgment in regard to it. That fact only proves a degree of incompetency on the part of the queen and her advisers for the high and solemn duties of the times. But England's deepest humiliation in connection with this Turkish matter was reached during the war between Russia and Turkey in 1877, although at the time she seemed to have achieved a diplomatic triumph. The origin of that war is well known. It grew out of a long series of outrages committed by the Turkish government upon the Christian populations of its European provinces. The Turkish government seemed to have lost all fear of any effective intervention on the part of the governments of Europe, and freely indulged in the slaughter of its Christian subjects. These atrocities reached their greatest severity in Bulgaria in the year 1876, where Turkish soldiers marched about having fixed upon their bayonettes unborn babes ripped from the wombs of their mothers, and where other crimes were committed that could not be told in print. These astrocities were investigated and their truth vouched for by Mr. Eugene Schuyler, Secretary of the American Legation at Constantinople, in a report dated November 20, 1876. Against these outrages the Christian governments of Europe did nothing but make feeble protests; and when Russia at last in the name of humanity declared war against Turkey, the English government quietly assured the assassins in Constantinople that Russia would not be

permitted to do them any hurt. And when the war was over, and Turkey thoroughly defeated, it was the English government, which was then in the hands of a certain Mesphistophelian Jew, that nullified the fruits of the victory, and gave a new lease of power to the decrepit empire of the Turk, which made possible the horrors of the Armenian and other massacres of more recent times. And for all this the English queen was made Empress of India, and D'Israeli became Lord Beaconsfield! And what shall we say of the war now being carried on in South Africa against the Dutch republics? Is it a noble thing for mighty England to murder a feeble nation in order to get hold of her diamond mines and gold fields? For that, after all the dust that may be raised about it, seems to have been the original motive of this war. Had there been no Cecil Rhodes, the Boers might have been left in quiet possession of their farms. And because these Boers are not willing at once to renounce their rights to their farms, their independence, and their life, the English government is waging a war that equals in cruelty anything the Spaniards did in Cuba, and, like George III., is arming the savage African tribes as its allies, and spending millions of money, at the same time that millions of her Imperial Majesty's subjects are starving in India, and the world is appealed to for charity in their behalf. Americans at least should have no difficulty in comprehending the baseness of this whole abominable business; and the probability is that, if we were not ourselves engaged in certain operations of questionable morality, the whole continent would be ringing with denunciations of England's iniquity.

But it may be said that the queen was opposed to all this nefarious business. And no doubt she was. Indeed, it has been said that this unfortunate Boer war was the thing that broke the aged queen's heart, and hastened her death. But what was the extent of her opposition to it; and how did she give expression to that opposition? Was it by means of some feeble remonstrances, and some tears perhaps, and then affixing her name to the marching orders of her armies? We cannot answer that question; but we do know that in her name the Eng-

glish armies have been fighting and killing in South Africa, as once they fought as Inkerman and Sebastopol. And her name has been the charm by which the hearts of the English soldiers have been fired in their battles with the Dutch farmers. When the Presbyterian Council at Washington refused to vote on a resolution recommending arbitration to the British and Transvaal governments before going to war, the British members claimed that such a vote on their part would be a direct slap at the queen, something of which they could, of course, not think of being guilty. We think that that position was a rather severe slap at themselves; it made them appear as very small men; but it showed at least what they supposed to be the queen's relation to the acts of her government. In view of all these circumstances we may suppose, then, that the queen's opposition to the African war could not have been very strong or very pronounced, although we may not doubt that her feelings were against it. But could we expect anything more? The queen was not only a woman, and, therefore, ill fitted to oppose her wily ministers who claimed to represent the will of the nation; but she was a sovereign and had a dynasty to take care of. And to that interest it would be necessary for her to sacrifice much of her personal conviction and feeling.

And yet, in spite of her Toryism, the queen is generally believed to have been more of a genuine democrat than most of her people, and many who are not her people. She was the *people's* queen. The masses loved and adored her. And she was sincerely devoted to the interests of the people, and studied how to improve their condition. She had none of that contempt for the people which some other rulers entertain, and some also who are not rulers. It is a somewhat common thing in this country of late years to hear expressions of contempt for democracy. The people who know not the ways and luxuries of the aristocracy our modern Pharisees declare accursed. There is a tentency to magnify European, especially English, institutions at the expense of our own. This tendency may be due in some measure to the corruption of our politics. Men who have just

voted for the most corrupt machine boss in the state, may be heard deploring the fact that our politics are not as clean as those of England. But this tendency to depreciate the people may be due in some measure also to the aristocratic feelings produced in certain classes by the increase of wealth. And this tendency will probably be intensified now by the study of the life and fortunes of Queen Victoria. Our *fine* men and women, who live in ease and have no conception of the struggle of life, will easily be dazzled by the splendors of royal boudoirs and drawing rooms, which are not for common people. And so, between tears for the queen, and eulogies of English institutions, we may expect to hear some sneers at democracy. This is foolish; and those who commit such folly may be regarded as people of small brains and small hearts, however large may be their purses. And it is a poor way of honoring the English queen; for she, in spite of her throne and her crown, had human feeling enough to treat the common people with honest respect and sincere love. In spite of the high station to which the accident of birth had raised her, she had common sense enough to know that the government exists, not for the sake of the sovereign, but for the sake of the people; and her efforts to benefit the people made her the people's favorite. Her sentiments in this respect may have been inconsistent with her position; but that rather adds to her honor than detracts from it. We certainly believe that democracy, or government of the people, by the people, and for the people, is inconsistent with hereditary monarchy. In this country happily we have no such logical inconsistency to support. The essence of our government, and its form, are such as Victoria's own deeper principles of humanity would naturally produce. Hence there should be no desire now, while we join with the English people in expressions of respect for their queen, to go back to their antiquated system of government. The essence of our system is better than theirs; but it is a system that must be kept free from corruption and perversion, in order that it may produce its proper results. And it is a system that permits no return to any previous form of government. We may permit our govern-

ment to become corrupt, and suffer the consequences; but we can never institute any other. Supposing even that monarchy were ever so much better than democracy, how could we ever get a monarchy? Whence could we get a monarch? Would we be willing to crown any one of our living presidents, or any one of our senators—Mr. Quay, for instance—or would we consent to the introduction of one of the numerous unemployed princes of the Victorian dynasty? No, monarchy may still do for a while for the English people, but for us it is impossible; and the only thing that we can do is to keep our democracy pure and honest. And they are enemies of our country who would advise or suggest any departure from the rules of democracy. We can join in honoring the queen without infidelity to the principles of our own institutions. Victoria may have been a very good queen for England, but we can use neither queen nor king.

Biblical Criticism and the Religious Value of the Bible.

One of the charges most frequently brought against the modern science of Biblical criticism, both in its higher and lower forms, is that it is *destructive*. In a certain sense this charge must be admitted to be correct. The higher criticism of the Bible especially has led to some destructive results. It has destroyed certain traditional conceptions of the Bible, which heretofore have been considered essential to a proper estimate of its value. For instance, it has destroyed some of the older theories of the inspiration and composition of the Bible. The doctrine of verbal or plenary inspiration, inherited by the Church from the Synagogue, held somewhat loosely during the middle ages, and brought into prominence after the Reformation by the stress of controversy, has been pretty generally given up by the adherents of the higher criticism. In one of the seventeenth century confessions, the Consensus Tigurinus, it was maintained that not only every word and letter, but also the Hebrew vowel points and the Greek accents were immediately given by inspiration of God. Hence the

Bible in all its statements must be absolutely infallible. This theory has been overthrown by the discovery that vowel points and accents, as well as punctuation marks, were inventions of the middle ages, and that there are numerous variations and discrepancies in both Testaments, the existence of which is wholly inconsistent with infallibility. These variations and discrepancies have usually been set to the account of copyists. Copyists were not infallible; and these, therefore, may have corrupted the text by allowing errors to slip into it. But if the door to the acceptance of errors in the Bible is thus opened in one place, where shall we stop? Is not this raising spirits that may not go down at our bidding? Where is our infallible Bible after we have admitted that the copyists may have sown it full of errors?

But the higher criticism has also overthrown the received tradition concerning the composition and genuineness of some Biblical books. This tradition, too, as far as the Old Testament is concerned, was originally received from the Synagogue. According to a tract of the Babylonian Talmud, Moses wrote the Pentateuch, with the exception of the last eight verses; Joshua wrote his own book; Samuel wrote the books which go by his own name, as well as Judges and Ruth; and David wrote the Psalms, some of which, however, were composed by Adam, Abraham, Moses, Jeduthun, and Asaph. The other books were written by the men whose names are attached to them; though they were subsequently edited by Hezekiah and his friends, by the men of the Great Synagogue, and by Ezra. Now modern criticism has shown that such traditions generally are worthless. Moses, the critics say, did not write the Pentateuch. They hold that it consists of at least four separate documents, which were written at widely different times and places, but all subsequent to the age of Moses. This conclusion has been supported by proofs which to one familiar with such studies are irresistible. A like critical study of the Psalms has proven that David was not, and could not have been, their author. The author of the last twenty-six chapters of the book of Isaiah was not the historical Isaiah, but an unknown prophet who lived late in the time of the captivity;

and the book of Daniel was not composed in the time of Cyrus, but in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. In the New Testament the results of criticism have not been so sweeping, but they have been sufficiently important to cause us to modify considerably our traditional conceptions of this portion of our Sacred Scriptures. For instance, we could no longer speak of the Synoptic Gospels as three independent narratives of the life of our Lord, but must regard them rather as three variations of one tradition. So, then, it is true that modern Biblical criticism has destroyed some previously received notions of the Bible. Instead of regarding the Bible as a book of oracles, criticism regards it as a body of sacred literature, whose authors can, in many cases, no longer be identified.

But it has also destroyed certain current conceptions of religion. For instance, it has put an end to the theory that the Bible is religion, or the theory that religion consists in holding certain dogmatic truths and performing certain rites, which are infallibly revealed in the Bible. This has been called *dogmatic religion*. A dogma, as usually defined, is an accepted truth of divine revelation, whose contents may be theoretical or practical. Now religion is dogmatic when it consists essentially in the acceptance and confession of such truths. The channel for the revelation of such truths may be supposed to be either the Church and the Bible, or the Bible alone. In the former case we have Romanism; in the latter case we have Protestantism according to the idea of the seventeenth century. The Romanist said, in order to be religious you must accept a certain sum of religious truths; and these truths must be precisely and correctly formulated, for if they were not, your religion would not be acceptable to God. So far the Protestant of the seventeenth century, and later, agreed with the Romanist. But now the latter went farther and contended that the formulation of divine truth is the business of the Church, which uses for this purpose the Bible and tradition as coördinate sources of authority. To this the Protestant replied, no, the Bible alone is the religion of Protestants; it contains clearly and explicitly all the truths which it is necessary

for a Christian to hold; and as for getting them out of the Bible, that is the business of private judgment. Between these theories there is really not much difference; and in the light of Biblical criticism neither of them is any longer tenable. If the Bible is not an infallible code of dogmatic truths miraculously let down from heaven, but a body of literature embodying the progressive religious knowledge and experience of a people, then the theory of dogmatic religion, both in its Protestant and in its Catholic form, must be given up.

But the giving up of the theory of a thing, is not in itself the giving up of that thing. And to say that Biblical criticism has undermined or destroyed a certain theory of religion, is not to say that it has destroyed religion. The Copernican theory of astronomy destroyed the Ptolemaic theory, but it did not destroy the sun, the planets, and the stars. It only made possible a truer and more rational knowledge of the heavenly bodies. So Biblical criticism, while it destroyed a theory of religion, did not destroy religion itself. What is religion? Some have said, it is doctrine or dogma extracted from an infallible Bible, either by an infallible church, or by a body of learned theologians. In that case, of course, it would be vitally affected by the results of Biblical criticism. Others have said, with Cicero, starting from the etymology of the Latin word, that it is ritualism, the constant repetition of the things which pertain to the worship of the gods, such as the decoration of images, offering of sacrifices, chanting of hymns and prayers. So far as the etymology of the word is concerned we believe that Cicero is right; for the idea of an outward ritualism was doubtless the Roman conception of religion at the time when the word was formed. But that is not the deepest conception of religion; and if it were, then again religion would rise or fall with the critical study of the book of rules by which the ritual is supposed to be governed. We believe that a better conception of religion is that which defines it as the sense of communion with God, or as the experience of the life of God in the soul. In its most perfect or Christian form, then, religion is the experience of the life of God in the soul, as

determined and brought to its highest expression through the revelation of God in Christ. And that is something that criticism has not destroyed, and never can destroy. It is above all critical conflicts. How could the criticism of a book destroy that which is most fundamental in the life of the human soul?

But while the Bible is not the foundation of the religious life of the soul, and while this life could, therefore, not be destroyed by any criticism of the Bible, it is nevertheless true that the Bible has a very high value for the Christian religious life. Has that value been at all affected by the results of Biblical criticism? We believe that it has, but only favorably. Criticism has not destroyed the religious historical value of the Bible. For the history of the evolution of religion in humanity collectively and in the human soul individually the Bible has as much authority and value in the critical view as it ever had in the dogmatic view. To be sure it has ceased to be an infallible textbook on universal history and on science. Its authority is now limited to religion. And this limitation is due to the higher criticism, which has disclosed its imperfections along other lines. But in spite of this limitation, we still go to it for an exact knowledge of the nature and history of religion; which is something different, however, from philosophical or speculative theology. The Bible, even in the light of the highest modern criticism, is a record of the progressive knowledge of God and of the life which is the effect of such knowledge, among the most religious people in the world. There are other sacred books besides the Bible; but in none of them does the tide of religious knowledge and life reach so high a point as in the Christian Scriptures. This is the confession of those who have studied these Scriptures most critically and thoroughly. It is, however, to the knowledge of God and its effects in the human soul that the Bible is principally devoted. If we would study art, or science, or history, we would resort to other literature than that of the Bible. It is not all sorts of knowledge, but the knowledge of God that the Bible promotes. And such knowledge doubtless presupposes a special self-revelation of God. God from of old has revealed

Himself in the works of creation, in history, and especially in the lives of chosen individuals. And it is this self-revelation of God, of His character and will, that forms the essential content of the Bible. It is for the purpose of this self-revelation of God that the Bible was written; and if its use now be confined to this purpose, the critic will have no objection to it at all. He demurs to the notion that we are to be governed by the Bible in our thinking on other subjects than religion. But to the idea that we are to be governed by it in our thinking of God, and in our feeling in relation to Him, no critic has ever offered any objection. Indeed this is the idea for which the critics themselves contend. That the Bible is most strictly a record of divine revelation in its progressive unfolding among a chosen people and of a corresponding religious life, is the conclusion that has been established by the best modern criticism.

The value of the Bible, accordingly, is chiefly religious in its nature. Whatever other value it may have, that is only secondary and incidental; this is primary and fundamental. And this value consists in the ideal of religion, or of religious life, which the Bible contains. This ideal is its inspiration, or its power of quickening, stimulating and cultivating the religious life in men now. The *theopneustia*, or breath of God, which is in the Bible, is the power of the religious ideal, which cannot be destroyed by any criticism of the letter, nor enjoyed by any cultivation of it. The religious value of the Bible may, therefore, be compared to the esthetic value of a piece of art. A production of art embraces an ideal. This ideal animated the soul of the artist, and is now in his work; and the susceptible student is affected and moved by that ideal. The reader of Shakespeare, for example, in so far as his soul is capable of poetic feeling, is enabled to reproduce the feelings which filled the soul of the poet in the moment of composition. In the composition of a drama Shakespeare may use much of the knowledge of history and science that prevailed in his day; but it would be a mistake to study such drama merely for the sake of that knowledge, or even for the sake of getting a theory of art. So with the study of

the Bible. The historical, scientific and philosophical material which the Bible contains serves only as setting for the real religious content, or for the religious ideal, which it embodies. And he who approaches the Bible for the sake of that ideal is thereby enabled to think the same thoughts and feel the same emotions which were in the minds of prophets and apostles at the time when they wrote. It is religion only, not even a *theory* of religion, that the Bible is intended to foster. And he who comes to it for this purpose will never come in vain. The spirit which is in it, the testimony of Jesus, the ideal of a Christian religious life, will elevate his feelings, quicken his understanding and strengthen his will. And this result will be quite independent of any theory of Biblical historicity. The late Professor Cornill of Königsberg was one of the higher critics. He did not believe in the historicity of the book of Jonah. He regarded it as a religious romance; yet he bears this testimony to its religious power and value: "I have read the book of Jonah at least a hundred times, and I will publicly avow, for I am not ashamed of my weakness, that I cannot even now take up this marvelous book, nay, nor even speak of it, without tears rising to my eyes, and my heart beating quicker." And George Adam Smith, in a work noticed elsewhere in this issue of the REVIEW, says: "The most advanced modern criticism provides grounds for the proof of a divine revelation in the Old Testament at least more firm than those on which the older apologetic used to rely;" while Professor Budde, a pupil of Kuenen, says of himself that his "belief in a genuine revelation of God in the Old Testament remains rock-fast."

But it has been said that the higher criticism has destroyed the idea of the *supernatural*. We cannot now treat this point at length, but must be content to say that the "supernatural" which criticism has destroyed, was not the true, but only a pseudo-supernaturalism. What is the supernatural? That which is spiritual, or that which is outside of the chain of necessary physical causation. God, the soul, and religion are supernatural. Has criticism destroyed the idea of any of these

supernatural realities? But it may be said that it has destroyed the idea of miracles. Without here entering into the question of the correctness of this charge, or into the question of the possibility of miracles, we would ask, what would be lost of the *religious value* of the Bible, if the charge were true? It is commonly acknowledged that there are no miracles occurring now; and those which are said to have taken place in the past, whether in ecclesiastical or Biblical history, cannot now be verified in our experience; and how, then, could they verify anything else to us? Do they prove the existence of God? Why, the proof is more difficult of acceptance than the thing to be proved. How then could we be the worse off if a negative conclusion should prevail in regard to the Biblical miracles, so long as we may have experience of the presence and power of God in Christ, and of the value of the Bible for our spiritual life? But here we must leave this subject, to which we may come again in the future.

Among Our Exchanges.

The Biblical World, published by the University of Chicago, is one of the most valuable theological publications of the day. It is devoted especially to systematic Bible study according to the historical method. An editorial article in the March number of the current year discusses some implications of this method. One of these is that the Bible is "not a book, but the literature of a nation and of a religious community. * * * In the Bible we have the literary remains of every stage of the rise and fall of the Hebrew people. The saga, the folk-tale, the chronicle of the preliterary period; the history and legislation, political and religious teaching of national maturity; the lamentation, the prayer and the song of praise and faith from years of national misery—all these have gone to make up the Old Testament. Similarly in the New Testament there are the writings of primitive, of Pauline, and of Catholic Christianity." But the literature is the record of a growing knowledge of God. "The

recognition of the fact that the literature composing the Bible is the product of different ages and historical situations carries with it the further recognition of the development of the idea of God, which this literature has preserved. * * * But such a record of the growing knowledge of God is but another name for a growing revelation of God." But revelation implies human experience and is impossible apart from it. And as the subjects of this experience are *imperfect* men, it follows that it may be outgrown. "Nay, in so far as it is conditioned by moral imperfection, it must be outgrown. The very fact that it was sufficient for one age makes it insufficient for that age's successors. For revelation is dynamic, it not only fills but enlarges one's needs, and it can be final only in proportion to the moral development of the person through whom it is made." Among the contributed articles of this number one of the most interesting is on *Exegesis as an Historical Study*, by Prof. B. W. Bacon, New Haven, Conn. *The Biblical World* is valuable not only to ministers, but to Sunday-school teachers and intelligent Christians generally. Its spirit is that of the higher or historical criticism.

* * *

The Bible Student, Columbia, S. C., is published monthly in the interest of conservative Biblical scholarship. Its object is to counteract what are believed to be erroneous views concerning the origin, authority, and religious and ethical value of the Bible. It is said to be "conducted in the interest of no church or party, but of the *Bible as the word of God;* its matter furnished by representatives of the most accurate scholarship and best thought in all the Evangelical Churches;" and it is declared to be "a journal prepared to welcome all real light from whatever quarter, but feeling free to discriminate between real light and all mere *ignes fatui.*" The Editor-in-chief is W. M. McPheeters, D.D., who is assisted by a large corps of editors and contributors in a number of churches. In an editorial article in the January number of the current year on *Improved Exegesis*, it is said that "Fanciful interpretations [of the Bible] are well-nigh things

of the past. Exegesis under dogmatic prepossessions is now considered utterly unscientific. We no more read back later ideas into the words of the author whose book we are studying. The aim of the modern commentator is to put himself as precisely as possible in the historical situation of his author, to observe as accurately as may be the character of the language which he used, the meaning of the words in that period, the grammatical usages both of the age and of the individual writer in question, and thence to ascertain with precision the thought which the writer meant to express. This seems to us now the most natural thing in the world to do." That we believe is a fair representation of what modern exegesis is, and ought to be. We believe, however, that this exegetical principle is violated in an article on the *One Hundred and Tenth Psalm* contributed by Dr. G. C. M. Douglass, of Scotland, in which the authorship of this Psalm is supposed to be settled by the use made of it by our Lord in Matt. 22: 41–46. "Take David's authorship away," says the writer, "and His argument falls to pieces. We can not for a moment admit that our Lord was mistaken. Nor can we allow that He was using what is called an *argumentum ad hominem*, saying something to silence the scribes on their own principles, without meaning that their principles were true." Is that not after all dogmatic exegesis?

* * *

In the December number of the *New World*, one of our most valued exchanges, Prof. George B. Stevens, of Yale University, has the following to say on theological institutions: "The limitations and deficiencies of our theological institutions are due to many causes. Like our colleges, they are far too numerous. This fact is due to the same causes which are responsible for the excessive multiplication of colleges—among them sectarian zeal, local pride, and enthusiam for some particular form of belief current at the time. Well-meant intentions, coupled with a very limited outlook upon the interests of the kingdom of God as a whole, are largely responsible for the present excess of theological schools with its embarrassing consequences. The

peculiar type of theological thought which some school was founded to represent passes away and is forgotten; the controversies, local, theological or personal, which gave rise to competing institutions die out, and upon those who come after and who wish merely to prosecute theological education in the most effective way, are entailed the limitations and embarrassments arising out of ancient and extinct controversies. I make all due allowance for the fact that we have many denominations, and that, in the nature of the case, each of these must have its repre sentative schools. But even then we have too many. There is scarcely a denomination which has not more schools than it can properly support. * * * This increase in the number of schools means weakness on all sides—insufficient support and an insufficient number of teachers, difficulty in commanding the services of the kind of men who are needed as teachers, inadequate equipment in general, and, worse than all, a keen competition for students, the effect of which upon the make-up of the student-body and upon the ranks of the ministry is far from wholesome." These are words of truth and soberness; and they should be carefully weighed by men who are responsible either for the origin or continuance of theological institutions which have no cause for existence other than the vanity or bigotry of a few self-conceited theologians, who imagine that the coming of the kingdom of God depends upon the acceptance of their theological views. Such institutions must exercise an unwholesome moral as well as intellectual influence upon all who are connected with them.

* * *

The American Journal of Theology, edited by the Divinity Faculty of the University of Chicago, is one of the leading theological quarterlies of the country. The January number of the current year contains an able article by L. Henry Schwab, of New York, entitled *A Plea for Ritschl.* The author says it "is unfortunate that up to the present time, the English and American reader, if he is limited to literature in the English language is almost wholly dependent for his knowledge of the

German theologian upon unfavorable criticisms." The author of this article is in sympathy with his subject, and presents Ritschlianism in an altogether favorable light, because he *understands* it. One of the peculiarities of Ritschl's thought is the distinction between *theoretical judgments* and *value judgments*, the former depending upon a merely intellectual process, the latter upon a process of thought and feeling combined. As bearing upon this point we present the following paragraph: "Apply this theory to the central truth of Christianity, the divinity of Christ. The older theology sought for proof-texts and built upon the record of the resurrection. But the texts themselves need to be proved true, and if the resurrection can be proved as a historical fact, there is an end of all argument. But in that case people could not refuse to believe it, as many do. We see clearly, therefore that Christianity can not rest upon such weak premises, neither in fact does it except in the imagination of theological logicians. If, on the other hand, following a safer method toward the solution of the Christological question, we allow ourselves to come under the spell of the character which the Gospel depicts for us, if we measure the lofty claims He made, and if then we feel it to be a psychological impossibility that He whose life was so beautiful, and who, withal, was so sober, should have been either a deceiver or self-deceived—in the mental process through which we pass in forming this judgment we base our conclusion upon the truth of those feelings which the story of Christ's life excites in us, of which we can give no logical account; and this is the 'value judgment.' And from this first impression, this 'value judgment,' we proceed, by a process which is more of the nature of dialectical reasoning, to the divinity of Christ."

IX.

NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

[Any books noticed in this department will be furnished, at the lowest prices, by the *Reformed Church Publication Board*, 1306 Arch St., Philadelphia, Pa.]

JESUS CHRIST AND THE SOCIAL QUESTION. *An Examination of the Teaching of Jesus in its Relation to Some of the Problems of Modern Social Life.* By Francis Greenwood Peabody, Plummer Professor of Christian Morals in Harvard University. Pages, vii + 374. The Macmillan Company, New York, 1900.

Books like this are becoming numerous; and they are signs of the times, pointing to a peculiar social condition. They imply that the social and economic world is not in a state of profound peace. In fact it is the very opposite. It is in a state of agitation, discontent, uncertainty and questioning, such as has never existed before. The elements of society are largely arrayed against each other—the laboring classes against the employing classes, the poor against the rich, the servants against their masters. This social unrest affects all social spheres, the family, the state, and the economic and industrial world. The two most immediate causes of this unrest are the exploitation of labor and the concentration of capital. And the remedies proposed for this condition of things are numerous. We have offered to us anarchism, communism, socialism in a great variety of forms. These the world refuses to accept. But does this imply that the evil against which these theories are aimed does not exist—that all is sweet and lovely in the social and industrial world, and that the socialists and communists are merely idle agitators, clamoring without reason against the very best social system? That may be the conviction of many, who deprecate all reflection and study of the social state. They believe that all speaking and writing on the subject must necessarily do harm. But there is an ever-increasing number of good and able men who can not be satisfied with this view. They can not accept the communistic programme, and yet they can not be satisfied to let things remain as they are. They look to all possible quarters for light and relief; and a rapidly multiplying number are looking to the teaching of Christ and the apostles for the help which is needed. Among this number is Professor Peabody, the author of the volume which is here introduced to the notice of our readers.

The contents of the volume are arranged in seven chapters with the following headings respectively: *The Comprehensiveness of the Teaching of Jesus; The Social Principles of the Teaching of Jesus; The Teaching of Jesus Concerning the Family; The Teaching of Jesus Concerning the Rich; The Teaching of Jesus*

Concerning the Care of the Poor; The Teaching of Jesus Concerning the Industrial Order; The Correlation of the Social Questions. The first chapter deals largely with the origin and nature of the social questions which are agitating and disturbing our age. "There lies at the heart of the present age a burdening sense of social mal-adjustment which creates what we call the social question," says our author, and then observes in the language of Prof. Wagner, that this social question "comes of the consciousness of a contradiction between economic development and the social ideal of liberty and equality which is being realized in political life." The one social question, however, resolves itself into a number of subordinate questions; and these are different from the social questions of any previous age. The age of Jesus had its social questions, too, but they are not just the same as those which oppress our age. How, then, can the teaching of Jesus be appealed to in order to the settlement of any of our modern questions? Only on the supposition that his teaching is of so comprehensive a nature that while it answers the questions of his own age, it answers in principle the questions of all ages. And this is the case in fact. Jesus in his teaching presents no social methods or rules, just as He presents no scientific or theological conclusions. Jesus lives among men; and in His life and teaching is the revelation of God; and that revelation contains all the light that men need for their social redemption, as well as for the redemption of their souls. This implies, of course, that Christianity is not merely an arrangement to make men happy in the other world, but to redeem their lives from the curse of corruption and vanity resting upon them here. Jesus' teaching concerning the *Kingdom of God* clearly involves this conception.

What, then, is the principle of the social teaching of Jesus? Our author answers that it is the idea that "the social order is not a product of mechanism, but of personality, and that personality fulfills itself only in the social order." Let personality be right and the social order will become right. The author sums up what he supposes to be the leading principles of the teaching of Jesus in the following terms: "The view from above, the approach from within, and the movement toward a spiritual end; wisdom, spirituality, idealism; a social horizon, a social power, a social aim." Jesus, according to our author, takes His position quite above the plane of our earthly social life, in the sphere of the personal and spiritual, assuming that if men's personal life were right, they might be happy in any social order. It is not so much the nature of the social constitution as the moral character of men that determines their weal or woe. "Much social suffering is due to the social order; but much and probably more is due to human sin." So we are told, page 117. This is doubtless true; but is it not true also that sin has produced some mal-adjustments in the social order, which a right adjustment of personality would remove or modify? We are constantly told by the defenders of the old

order, including economic trusts and the exploitation of labor, that if men were not sinners they could be happy under any social conditions. This may be true, but would there be trusts and exploitation if men were not sinners? There has been a tendency among theologians and preachers, and our author is not quite free from it, to preach too much to the poor and unfortunate sinners and not enough to the rich and prosperous sinners. The laborer, whose toil is exploited to make his employer rich, has been told that it is a sin to be discontented with his wages, and to suppose that his happiness will depend upon the amount of goods which he possesses; but it is not so often that the employer is told that it is a sin to exploit the labor of his fellowmen as if they were but soulless cattle. We believe that a more thorough study of the social teaching of Jesus would give a somewhat different tone to the social teaching of many modern theologians and preachers from that which now characterizes it.

The principle which, according to Professor Peabody, governs Jesus' teaching concerning the social order in general is, of course, supposed to govern His teaching concerning the family. He had frequent occasion to discuss the subject of the family. But He never approached it from the earthly, legal standpoint. The question of divorce was for Jesus not a legal question, to be settled by inflexible legal propositions. It was a moral and spiritual question, and Jesus never supposed that the kingdom would be made to come by refusing all applications for divorce. He viewed this question, too, from above and approached it from within; and the only true solution of it now must be reached in the same way. The same is supposed to be true in regard to Jesus' teaching concerning the rich and the poor. In regard to this subject our author points out a difference in tone of the teaching contained in St. Luke and in other parts of the New Testament. In St. Luke Jesus is much more severe upon the rich than He is in the other Gospels. This implies that His teaching may have been modified somewhat by the minds of the different evangelists before it came to be fixed in writing, and that we must now often apply critical methods in order to get a probable conception of His exact words. There is, however, no difference in principle in His teachings as found in different evangelists. Everywhere Jesus shows Himself to be the friend of the poor, whom the common people hear gladly, and everywhere He sternly warns the rich of their perils. But Professor Peabody points out that "there is certainly no ground for believing that Jesus proposed to array the poor against the rich. * * * His teaching moved in a world of thought and desire where such distinctions become unimportant. * * * He gathered about Him all sorts and conditions of men and women. * * * He was equally at home at the table of the prosperous Zaccheus, in the quiet home at Bethany, and in the company of the blind beggar." This is true, and yet it misses somewhat of the whole truth. In such language the unrighteous

plutocrat might find some comfort; but there would be much less chance for this if he remembered that after Jesus had entered into his house Zaccheus restored his ill-gotten wealth fourfold, and gave the half of his goods to feed the poor. If every "rich man" would do that, then Jesus would doubtless love the rich as much as the poor.

We have not space to enter into any exposition of our author's views of the teaching of Jesus concerning the poor or concerning the industrial order. We can only say that the treatment is rich and full and upon the whole satisfactory. We would especially call attention to what the author says on page 253 on the present tendency to charitable institutionalism, or institutional charity. Hospitals and homes for children, etc., are good; but it would be better if, for instance, all orphan children could be cared for in Christian homes. "The hope of permanent amelioration of life lies in the escape from mass treatment and in the adaptation of relief to the individual case." In the last chapter of the book under notice the author shows that all social questions are in fact but one question, or that all social questions are so correlated that the consideration of any one will in the end lead to the consideration of all others. Take the temperance question, and you are brought to the question of the home, of wages, of taxation, etc. Are people poor because they are intemperate, or are they intemperate because they are poor? These and innumerable other questions the moralist and social philosopher must meet. Whatever tends to spread poverty, will also tend to spread intemperance. Hence the temperance reformer will at last meet the question of trusts, of tenement houses, etc. We close this notice with one observation. While the work before us is able, learned, considerate, cautious, and apparently exhaustive, there is in it, we believe, one defect, and that is that it confines the teaching of Jesus concerning social questions merely to His utterances in the New Testament and the inferences that may be drawn therefrom. We believe that Jesus is a present, living personality, and that He is capable of social teaching now through the Spirit in living and prophetic men. The social principles which are now found pervading the Christian world are not merely inferences from the teaching of Jesus as contained in the New Testament, but impressions of the present and ever-living spirit of Christ. This we believe to be a truth which no theological teacher ought to forget. "When He, the Spirit of truth, is come, He will guide into all truth." This is not mysticism, but sound Christian teaching.

THE GERMAN IMMIGRATION INTO PENNSYLVANIA *through the Port of Philadelphia*, 1700 to 1775. Part II. THE REDEMPTIONERS. Prepared at the Request of the Pennsylvania-German Society. By Frank Ried Diffenderffer. Pages, ix + 330. Published by the Author, Lancaster, Pa., 1900. Price, $3.00.

This stately volume deals with two subjects, which are, however, in fact, closely connected, and are rightly treated in one

work. Mr. Diffenderffer, who possesses a warm heart and wields a facile pen, has written a good deal on the history of the Pennsylvania Germans; but the present volume is doubtless his most important contribution to the general subject of which it treats, namely, the Germans in America, their immigration, their numbers, their character, their fortunes and sufferings, and their contributions to the political and economic conditions of this country. Mr. Diffenderffer has spent much time in the study of his subject by means of original and authentic documents; and the preparation of this work has evidently been a labor of love for the race whose history he writes, and of which he is himself an honored and worthy member. We have read this book with deep interest, and have no doubt that the majority of the readers of this REVIEW, who are of the same race with the author and with ourself, will regard it with equal interest.

The Pennsylvania Germans, who not only form the backbone of the great State of Pennsylvania, but are now scattered over every State of the Union, have no reason to be ashamed of their race. And their self-respect will be much increased by a perusal of the volume before us. We have here an account of the early immigration of the Germans into this country, and of their settlement especially in Pennsylvania. This immigration began early in the eighteenth century, and had reached mammoth proportions in 1727, when it excited the apprehension of some of the English colonists, and laws began to be passed for its regulation. The registration laws which date from that time did not serve to lessen the number of immigrants, and are now chiefly valuable as furnishing data for the history of this German migration. The cause of this migration is to be found in the political and economic conditions of Germany at the time. There was neither political nor religious liberty; and the economic condition of the people was most wretched. In a letter addressed by Christopher Saur to Governor Morris, in 1755, concerning the trials and wrongs of the early German immigrants, quoted by Mr. Diffenderffer in this volume, that eminent and patriotic man says: "It is now thirty years since I came to this Province, out of a country where no liberty of conscience was, nor humanity reigned in the house of my then country lord, and where all the people are owned with their bodies to the lord there, and are obliged to work for him six days in every week, three days with a horse, and three days with a hoe, shovel, or spade; or if he cannot come himself, he must send somebody in his place." What time, then, was left to people to work for themselves? No wonder they were anxious to get out of such a country at any cost whatever. And as the condition of things was worse in the Palatinate of the Rhine than anywhere else, that country furnished by far the larger part of the immigrants; so that at first *all* German immigrants were called *Palatines* without regard to the place from whence they came. These Palatines were, with few exceptions, members of the Re-

formed Church; and Mr. Diffenderffer tells us that in 1750 there were already forty well-organized German Reformed congregations in Pennsylvania, and thirty Lutheran, besides a large number of "sect people," like Mennonites, Dunkers and Schwenkfelders.

And what was the character of this German immigration? As to worldly goods the most of the immigrants were poor, because they had been robbed by their "lords," in their native land, not only of their liberty, but of their homes and of the fruits of their labor. Some of them, too, were irreligious and immoral, as would be the case with the population of any land, if they were to emigrate *en masse*, as did the people of the Palatinate in the eighteenth century. But the great majority of them were honest, industrious, pious people, as is proven by the fact that they invariably brought with them their bibles, catechisms, and hymn books, and that they proceeded to establish churches as soon as they had reared shanties for their own homes in the wilderness. But what about their intelligence? They have frequently been represented as a rude and ignorant set of boors—mere clodhoppers, unworthy to associate with their Anglo-Saxon neighbors. Mr. Diffenderffer quotes a letter from Dr. Franklin to Peter Collinson, in which the former describes the German immigrants as "generally the most stupid of their nation, as ignorant, credulous, as disorderly and not knowing how to make a modest use of liberty." He states, however, that "they import many books from Germany, and of the six printing houses in the province, two are entirely German, two half German, half English, and but two are entirely English." On this Mr. Diffenderffer very pertinently remarks that a people who imported many books and supported more printing houses than their English neighbors, could after all not have been so very ignorant. In connection with this Mr. Diffenderffer quotes from *A History of Education in Pennsylvania*, by the late Dr. James P. Wickersham, the following passage: "When they (the Germans) came, they were usually accompanied by a clergyman or a schoolmaster, or both. They were not highly educated as a class, but among them were some good scholars, and few could be found who were not able to read. The impression has prevailed that they were grossly ignorant; it is unjust; those who make the charge either do not take the pains to understand, or wish to misrepresent them. Their average intelligence compared favorably with that of contemporary American colonists of other nationalities."

But what of the "Redemptioners"? Does not the fact that many of the German immigrants were too poor to pay their shipfare, and were sold as bond-servants, or slaves, for a series of years to work out the cost of their transportation, prove that they must have been a very inferior grade of people? On this question Mr. Diffenderffer's work contains full and accurate information, more than half of the volume being devoted to this subject. And in fact it is this part of the book that imparts to it special value,

as it contains information which has not heretofore been generally accessible. It may not have been generally known, but it is a fact that there existed in the province of Pennsylvania, and in the other American provinces of Great Britain, a species of white slavery, which, though regulated by law, was as repulsive and cruel as the system of negro slavery which afterwards prevailed in the South. Men, women, and children could be sold for debt, if not for their life-time, at least for the best period of their life. Husbands and wives, parents and children, could be sold to separate masters, if not outside of the province, at least in widely separated parts of the province. And this law existed in Pennsylvania until far into the nineteenth century. It applied, however, not merely to Germans but to people of all nationalities. There were English, Scotch, Irish, and Welsh Redemptioners, as well as German. The word *Redemptioners* was never used in the laws relating to the subject, nor the word *slaves*. The legal phrase was "indentured servants." An indentured servant was one who for some reason was bound to serve another without consideration for a period of years, during which time he was no more free to regulate his own movements than was ever a negro slave, although the law gave him some protection during the time of his servitude, and provided that at the expiration of it he was to be furnished with a new suit of clothes and some other necessary articles.

This idea of economic servitude originated in Great Britain, and was first applied to her own children. Wealthy English families would purchase a suite of servants from among their own broken-down countrymen previous to emigrating to America. The Virginia colonists especially belonged to this class. But a similar kind of servitude was early introduced into the other colonies as well as that of Virginia. But when the Germans began to come to America by thousands it was found that the system was one that could be worked with special profit among them. Many of them were poor from the start. They had been despoiled and plundered by French dragoons and Catholic landlords. But even if they had a little money when they started, they were robbed of it on the journey. The expense of the journey from the Palatinate to Philadelphia then was about $176.00. The trip down the Rhine occupied from six to eight weeks, in consequence of the many custom houses that had to be passed. And by the time the emigrant got out to sea his money was in many cases all spent. The chest which contained his few goods was either forgotten by the people of the ship, and left behind in Holland, or broken open and plundered during the passage. The horrors of the passage were often unspeakable. Ships were usually over-crowded. The food and water were deficient. Disease often raged among the passengers, and great numbers of them died and were thrown into the sea. When arrived in Philadelphia many were unable to pay the balance due on their passage, and were sold into bondage until they had paid the utmost farthing. Immigration agents, called

"Newlanders" in the language of the time, swarmed throughout Europe inducing people to emigrate, who would otherwise not have thought of leaving their native land. These were paid so much a head by the ship-captains in Holland or England, or by the slave-traders in Philadelphia. The money came out of the price at which the immigrants were sold.

The above is a very brief account of a painful chapter in the history of Pennsylvania. Those who desire full information in regard to the subject, should procure Mr. Diffenderffer's book and read it. Mr. Diffenderffer believes that, while the system was evil, yet good has come out of it. And we certainly agree with him. Many of the descendants of the Redemptioners are now prosperous citizens of Pennsylvania and other States. So providence over-rules evil for good in the process of human life. We have only to add, in conclusion of this notice, that Mr. Diffenderffer deserves the thanks of all Pennsylvania Germans for the publication of this elegant volume, by means of which a large part of their history in this country has been rescued from oblivion. The volume is profusely illustrated by pictures representing scenes in German-American life, articles of household furniture, and the like, which add much to its value.

A SYSTEM OF ETHICS. By Friederich Paulsen, Professor of Philosophy in the University of Berlin. Edited and Translated, with the Author's Sanction, from the Fourth Revised and Enlarged Edition. By Frank Thilly, Professor of Philosophy in the University of Missouri. Pages, xviii + 723. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1899. Price, $3.00.

The first thing the reader will observe while perusing this new *System of Ethics*, which appeared originally in German, is its easy intelligibility. We are not accustomed to expect treatises on ethics to be easy reading. The science presents some difficult problems; and we, accordingly, suppose that the discussion of them must necessarily be difficult too, and hard to understand. And this we expect to be the case especially in works translated from the German; for English translations of philosophical and theological works from the German have generally not been noted for their perspicuity. This was often due as much to the style of the German writers as to the want of ability on the part of the English translators. But persons who have been accustomed to this sort of work will be very agreeably surprised when they come to read this translation of Paulsen's Ethics. Professor Paulsen, like modern German writers generally, writes in an easy and perspicuous style. The long and involved sentences to which one is accustomed, for instance, in Dorner or Julius Müller, are absent from his composition. He knows how to express profound thought in clear and crisp sentences. This makes the work of the translator a comparatively easy task. But Professor Thilly evidently possesses special qualifications for such a task. Not only is he equally master of the German and the English lan-

guages; but he is thoroughly familiar also with the sphere of thought within which his work moves. These qualifications have enabled him to give to the English public a translation which possesses all the energy, perspicuity, and ease of the best English writers. The intelligent reader will find the most profound subjects discussed, in this volume, in language which it is a positive pleasure to read.

Professor Paulsen belongs to the modern historical or teleological school of ethical writers. He has learned something from the teachers of evolution as well as from the representatives of intuitionalism; and he is as far removed from the moral formalism of Kant as from the hedonistic utilitarianism of J. S. Mill. But in order to enable our readers to understand the fundamental principles and tendency of this book, we cannot do better than to quote a few sentences from the preface. "To bring the old truth into living touch with the questions which preoccupy our age," he says, "is, in my opinion, the most important function of modern ethics. Nor do I believe that I am mistaken in the assumption that this view is somewhat widespread in our time. * * * Let me here outline the conception towards which the thought of the age seems to be tending; I call it the *teleological* view. It is limited and defined by a double antithesis. On the one side, by *hedonistic utilitarianism*, which teaches that pleasure is the thing of absolute worth, to which virtue and morality are related as means. In opposition to this the teleological ethics contends that not the feeling of pleasure, but the objective content of life itself, which is experienced with pleasure, is the thing of worth. Pleasure is the form in which the subject becomes immediately aware of the object and its value. *Intuitionalistic formalism* is the other antithesis. This regards the observance of a system of *a priori* rules, of the moral laws, as the thing of absolute worth. In opposition to this, teleological ethics contends that the thing of absolute worth is not the observance of the moral laws, but the substance which is embraced in these formulæ, the human historical life which fills the outline with an infinite wealth of manifold concrete forms; that the moral laws exist for the sake of life, not life for the sake of the moral laws." These sentences involve our author's answer to the old question as to the *principle* of morality. Why is a man bound to speak the truth? Because it is required by the categorical imperative of the law, answered the formalist. No, said the utilitarian, but it is because it promotes the pleasure of the subject, or because it advances the greatest happiness of the greatest number. Professor Paulsen would say, with Dr. Green, Professor Janet, and the majority of most recent writers on ethics, that it is because it promotes the self-perfection of the moral subject. "The objective value of human conduct is ultimately determined by its relation to a final and highest end or good, which consists in the perfect development of being and the perfect exercise of vital functions." This, it should be observed, is not inconsistent

with the view that happiness or blessedness is the end of moral action, for in the perfect exercise of all vital functions there must be blessedness; nor is it inconsistent with the New Testament teaching that the highest good is the *kingdom of God*, for the kingdom of God is the sphere in which human existence has become most perfect.

Of the plan of the work before us the translator's preface contains the following concise account: "Professor Paulsen divides his work into four books. The first traces the historical development of the conceptions of life and moral philosophy from the times of the Greeks down to the present, and is one of the ablest and most fascinating surveys of the subject ever written. The second examines the fundamental questions of ethics and answers them in a manner indicating the author's clearness of vision and soundness of judgment. The third, which is full of practical wisdom applies these principles to our daily conduct, and defines the different virtues and duties. The fourth book is sociological and political in its nature, and deals with the 'Forms of Social Life.'" The last book has been omitted in the translation in order to keep the dimensions of the volume within reasonable limits. The translator intimates, however, that this may be given to the public in a future work. The omission of it, moreover, in the present work, does not at all affect its completeness as an ethical treatise; for all the subjects which are usually discussed in such treatises, namely, *the good*, *duty*, *virtue*, receive full consideration. Nothing is omitted that is essential to a complete work on Ethics; and the intelligent reader will find much that is not usually contained in English works on the subject. This last statement applies especially to the contents of the first book. Here we have a complete view not merely of the history of *ethical science*, but of ethical thought and life itself from its beginning in Greece down to the present time. The conception of moral life among the Greeks, the Christian conception of life, the conversion of the ancient world to Christianity, the middle ages and their conception of life, the modern conception of life, medieval and modern moral philosophy, these are the subjects which are treated in this book. The results reached in this historical discussion are sometimes startling, and will perhaps not be accepted by those who have not kept pace with the progress of ethical and theological thought in modern times. And even the most advanced thinkers will not always agree with the author's conclusions. The difference, however, we believe, will not be radical. For instance, in the chapter on the Christian conception of life, Paulsen seems to turn into a universal law the command addressed by Jesus to the rich young man, and adapted to his individuality, and then supposes that it would be impossible to carry out such a law. This supposition is doubtless correct; but we hold that it is incorrect to take an individual command for a universal law. Again, Paulsen admits that it is true that all Greek virtues are in the

light of Christianity splendid vices, because they are all rooted in man's natural impulse of self-preservation. This, however, he supposes to be true only of original Christianity, not of the Christianity of the present day. Ours is not the old Christianity, he says. This may be admitted, so far as *form* is concerned, even in relation to the apostolic age. And it must be admitted of course in relation to the ages that came after the time of the Apostles. Take any past age as the standard, and we must confess with Strauss that we are no longer Christians, for the old creeds no longer express the convictions of modern life. But how does our Christianity compare with the principles of Christ as contained in the New Testament, or with the mind of Christ, as it may be inferred from those principles? Compared with this standard, we hold that we would have to say, not that we are *no longer* Christians, but that we are *not yet* Christians in the full and complete sense. We believe that our modern Christianity is better, and more in agreement with the spirit of Christ, than was that of the Fathers and Confessors of earlier ages, by whom so sharp a contrast was made between "Nature and the Supernatural."

The philosophical student of ethics, however, will turn with chief interest to the second book of Professor Paulsen's work, in which are discussed the fundamental concepts and principles of moral science. The first and fundamental question in moral science is, What is good, and what is bad? The answer to this question determines the character of any scientific treatise on the subject of ethics. Paulsen characterizes his fundamental principle as *teleological energism*, and holds that such modes of conduct and volition are good as tend to realize the highest goal of the will, namely, the perfection of our being and the perfect exercise of life. After having determined his fundamental principle, he goes on to discuss various other problems connected with this part of his work. The chapter on *pessimism* is exceedingly interesting, but must here be passed over with this simple mention. The subject of the next chapter is *the evil, the bad, and theodicy*. Here we have an exhaustive discussion of the relation of physical to moral evil. The question whether disease and death are the consequence of sin, of course, comes in for consideration. The chapter on *duty* and *conscience* is very interesting to the student of ethics. The historical origin of conscience is, of course, recognized, and yet its binding authority is insisted on. "In conscience we have the subjective reflex of the objective natural order of moral life, as it has developed in custom and law; surely this knowledge can not destroy the validity or the teleological necessity of the order." *Egoism* and *altruism*, *virtue* and *happiness* are the subjects of the next two chapters. The discussion of *religion* and *morality*, in chapter eight, is of special interest to the theologian. We quote a few sentences: "Religion and morality spring from the same root, the yearning of the will for perfection. But that which is a demand in morals is a reality in religion.

* * * Many believe that scientific knowledge has left religion nothing to stand on. I do not share this belief. * * * It is true that the belief in gods resembling human beings has been overthrown. And no monotheistic scheme which merely reduces the many gods to one, of the same kind, can maintain itself. * * * But the question remains, How shall we explain the universe?" The explanation follows in the succeeding pages, and is to the effect that we must assume the existence of an Infinite and Eternal Spirit. The *freedom of the will* is the subject of the last chapter of the second book; in which both the determination of it by natural causes, and its self-determination and responsibility are recognized. No man is ever born free. Freedom of will is an acquired condition.

The third book, as already stated, embraces the doctrine of *virtues* and *duties*. We have first a discussion of *virtues* and *vices* in general, and then of the *education of the will* and *the discipline of the feelings*. Here we have a comparison of tne Christian with the Greek virtues. The subjects of the remaining chapters are *bodily life, economic life, spiritual life and culture, honor and the love of honor, suicide, compassion and benevolence, justice, love of neighbor veracity*. In the treatment of all these subjects interesting and difficult problems present themselves, from a fair consideration of which the author never shrinks. These chapters are replete with practical suggestions as to the conduct of life. We have not space, however, to enter into particulars. But we do not hesitate, in conclusion, to recommend this volume to our readers who are interested in the philosophical study of ethics. It will be understood, of course, that the work does not claim to be a theological treatise, such as Martensen, Donner, Smythe, and others, have written. This, however, does not in the least diminish its importance and value. Works of this kind will always be helpful to the theologian and preacher; and we consider this work of Paulsen's as one of the best and most valuable of its kind.

MODERN CRITICISM AND THE PREACHING OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. *Eight Lectures on the Lyman Beecher Foundation, Yale University.* By George Adam Smith, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Old Testament Language and Literature, United Free Church of Scotland Glasgow College. Pages, xii + 325. A. C. Armstrong & Son, 3 and 5 West 18th Street, near 5th Avenue, New York. 1901.

Professor Smith is not a stranger to the readers of this REVIEW. Many have doubtless read his commentaries on *Isaiah*, and on the *Minor Prophets*, and his *Historical Geography of the Holy Land*. And those who have done so will expect, in any work coming from his hands, a high degree of interest and merit. He is a thorough student of the Bible, especially of the Old Testament, and whatever he may say on any subject comes with the authority which must and will always be accorded to thorough scholarship. He belongs to the school of the so-called *higher critics* who, rejecting the traditions concerning the formation of the Old Testament

canon derived from the later Judaism, claim the right of forming their opinions concerning the composition and character of the books of the Old Testament from a thorough philological and historical study of those books themselves, and are not afraid of arriving at conclusions different from those which have been held by Christian theologians of the past. But Professor Smith does not for that reason give up his faith in the Old Testament as a divine revelation; nor does he cease to preach it. And, in fact, it is the purpose of these Lectures, first delivered to a body of students preparing for the ministry, to show how the modern criticism of the Old Testament affects the use of it in the modern pulpit. There are those in the ministry—though not nearly as many now as there were a decade or two ago—to whom the *higher criticism* stands for all that is evil; and these would be especially benefited by the perusal of these lectures. They would discover that their fears as to the consequences of this criticism have in the main been groundless. This discovery has already been made in Scotland; and George Adam Smith is now an honored professor, undisturbed and at peace, in the same Church which drove W. Robertson Smith from his chair for holding the same views twenty years ago. What must be the feelings of the actors in that crusade now?

But we proceed to give our readers a more full account of the contents of the volume before us. The general purpose of it is well stated by the author himself in the preface. "The objects of the lectures," he says, "are, in the main, three: a statement of the Christian right of criticism; an account of the modern critical movement so far as the Old Testament is concerned; and an appreciation of its effects upon the Old Testament as history and as the record of a divine revelation." To the first of these objects is devoted the first lecture. In this lecture it is shown that Christ did not hesitate to criticise the Old Testament, and that the apostles and evangelists, by quoting from it often very loosely showed that they did not have that exaggerated notion of its verbal inspiration and inerrancy which later theologians have entertained. From this is inferred the right of the Christian theologian to exercise a critical function in regard to it likewise. The second lecture deals with the course and character of modern criticism. After a brief historical review of this criticism from the middle of the seventeenth century to the present time, the author proves that the charge that it is merely linguistic, subjective, and uncertain, and that it ignores the evidence of archeology, geography, and the allied sciences, is altogether unfounded. To the argument from the Tell el Amarna letters to the conclusion that the Israelites in the Arabian desert might have been able to read and write, and that therefore Moses *could* have written the Pentateuch, Professor Smith replies that these "letters are only the documents of high Egyptian or Mesopotamian officials, and of chiefs of settled tribes in Palestine; and that to argue

from their habits to those of a semi-nomadic race, such as Israel were still in Goshen and the desert, is not very safe."

In the third lecture is examined the historical basis in the Old Testament. If we must recognize myths and legends in the Old Testament, and books which are not historical, like Esther, Jonah, and Job, this does not prove that all is fictitious. The Old Testament as a whole is historical. But it is not for the sake of the history that it exists, but for the sake of the divine revelation which is contained therein. To the proof of a divine revelation in the Old Testament the fourth lecture is devoted. But by revelation the lecturer understands, "not the communication by supernatural means of many kinds of truth, but the revelation of God Himself, and that not of the fact of His existence, but of His ethical character and will for men." That the Israelites, subsequent to the age of the great prophets, had a truer knowledge of the nature and character of God than their Semitic neighbors admits of no doubt; and this fact, according to Professor Smith, can not be due merely to their national genius, nor to their environment, but must be traced to a special divine agency in their history. The spirit of Christ in the Old Testament forms the subject of the fifth lecture, which shows how the Old Testament bears witness of Christ, not so much by means of direct Messianic prophecy, of which when the facts are sifted there is not much, as by means of the general moral and religious spirit that pervades the whole of it. In this lecture the origin of the idea of *vicarious suffering* is discussed in a very suggestive and satisfactory way.

The subject of the sixth lecture is the Hope of Immortality in the Old Testament. And in this lecture it is shown that this is a subject that comes to light only in the latest writings. It is only in the latest books of the Old Testament, those which belong to the times subsequent to the Persian period, that a future life is distinctly recognized. How this fact should be treated by the modern preacher is also shown in this lecture. The seventh lecture is the longest in the volume. Its subject is: "The Prophets as Preachers to their own Times: with their Influence on the Social Ethics of Christendom." If on the one hand modern criticism has removed from many of the Prophets large portions of the books which bear their names, it has on the other hand proven that every part of the prophetic writings arises from real life, and that it is a message of a true prophet to living men, and deals with the essential problems of human society. This is what makes the prophetic literature of the Old Testament especially valuable to the modern preacher. If the modern preacher will in every case put himself in the place of the prophet, and from the prophet's relation to his own time catch his true spirit and principle, he will bring a far stronger message to men of the present age than he could bring if he supposed the prophet merely to have uttered enigmas. Professor Smith notes the fact that since the prevalence of critical opinions the preaching of the Scottish pul-

pit has much improved. It has become more spiritual, more ethical, more Christian. The cruelties and superstitions which were once inculcated in the pulpit because they were believed to be sanctioned by Hebrew law and the Hebrew Prophets, have been abandoned, and the pulpit now speaks in tones much more gentle and rational. The last lecture treats of the Christian Preacher and the Books of Wisdom, and shows how the books of Job, Proverbs, and Ecclesiastes, as viewed by the modern criticism, may be utilized in the Christian pulpit. To those among our readers who desire to know what the *higher criticism* really is, and how it will affect our faith in the Old Testament, and our use of it, we cordially commend this volume of lectures.

THE AGE OF FAITH. By Amory H. Bradford, D.D., author of "Spirit and Life," "Heredity and Christian Problems," etc. Pages, viii + 306. Houghton, Mifflin & Company, Boston and New York, 1901.

Many of the readers of this REVIEW will probably remember Dr. Bradford's sermon, preached several years ago in connection with the Commencement exercises of the Theological Seminary at Lancaster, Pa., on the subject which forms the title of this book. In fact the first chapter of the book is a somewhat close reproduction of that sermon. In speaking of the present age as an *age of faith*, the author does not deny that there is a good deal of scepticism abroad. Men question the truth of old systems of theology and philosophy. This, however, in most cases is not done because they do not want to believe, but because they want to be sure of the foundations of their faith. The study of Biblical criticism, for instance, as pursued at the present time, has for its aim, not destruction of the authority and influence of the Bible, but the removing of difficulties from the way of faith. The evidence of science and literature is appealed to in proof of the fact that the spirit of the age in which we are living is not un-Christian or unbelieving, but profoundly earnest and reverent, and anxious for the truth. The search for truth is more earnest and eager than ever before, and has already led to no inconsiderable results in the domain of Christian thought. Of these results it is the purpose of this book to give some account, and thus to help such as can no longer hold the old dogmas, in the forms in which they were once received, to the possession of a purer, better, and stronger faith.

The contents of the book are arranged in twelve chapters, under the following titles: The Age of Faith: The Conception of God; God Interpreted by Fatherhood; The Basis of Optimism; Brotherhood; Suffering and Sorrow; Sin; Salvation; Prayer; Punishment or Discipline; The Immortal Life; The Teacher for all Ages. While this table of contents would seem to imply a somewhat loose connection between the different chapters, the careful reader will after all observe that, as here treated, there is an inner logical relation between them. They are not mere separate es-

says, but they form a logical system united by one fundamental conception. That conception is the idea of the divine fatherhood. This idea, according to Dr. Bradford, is central in Christian thought. In the history of religious thought God has been interpreted upon different principles. One of these is the principle of *power*. Natural phenomena, like the storm or thunder, have been taken as the symbols of deity. This principle has led to polytheism. Another principle for the explanation of deity has been derived from the phenomena of human government. As political organization was developed among men and strong, ruling personalities came into prominence, God came to be regarded as a great sovereign, or ruler whose will was law for the universe. This implies that the deity is personal; and the scientific study of the universe has demonstrated that the divine personality must be one. But the conceptions of power, sovereignty, and unity are not the conceptions which give us the deepest insight into the nature of God. What is that conception which gives us the profoundest knowledge of God's nature and character? It is the conception of the divine fatherhood, says Dr. Bradford: and with this conception he would unlock the mysteries of the universe.

The subjects treated in this volume are all beset with difficulties. There is, for instance, the subject treated in the fourth chapter, namely, the different interpretations of the world and of human life in the theories of optimism and pessimism. The one says the world is essentially bad, and there is no good in it; the other says the world is essentially good, and there is no evil in it. But experience says, there is in it both evil and good. But suppose we ask, which of them is the predominating factor, and which will in the end prevail? Will this universe at last become all good, or all bad, or will there be in it an eternal moral dualism? How shall we answer such a question? Dr. Bradford thinks that the doctrine of the divine fatherhood alone can give us the true answer. It will not answer every question that we may be able to put in regard to the present order of the universe. But if we believe that God is our Father, and that fatherhood in Him is the same as in man, only multiplied by infinity, then we can believe that "good will be the final goal of ill," and that "good shall fall at last—far off—to all." "Pessimism," says Dr. Bradford, "is logical and usually inevitable where there is faith neither in God nor in the future life."

The correlative of divine fatherhood is human brotherhood. To believe in the one is necessarily to believe in the other. "Jesus teaches the universal fatherhood of God; and that necessitates the conclusion that in some way all men are of the same nature as the deity; and that in turn compels the further conclusion that there is and can be, no difference in the essential nature of various groups of men, and that all divisions between them other than ethical are artificial and ephemeral." Because men are in a most real sense, a sense that implies community of

nature, children of God, there is something sacred in humanity. "This," says our author, "is generally recognized now, but within a quarter of a century systems of theology began with the essential and natural worthlessness of man. Such doctrines are now giving place to emphasis on the worth and divinity of humanity. The change of emphasis is revolutionizing political economy as well as theology." And in this new conception of humanity, according to Dr. Bradford, lies the hope of society for the future. Communism, Socialism, even Anarchism, may each embody some social or economic truth; but they can not regenerate society and bring in the new social day of liberty, equality, and fraternity of which men are dreaming and for which they are praying. The only power that can do that is the Christian Gospel of the fatherhood of God. Dr. Bradford's treatment of the subject of human brotherhood is throughout exceedingly instructive and valuable in view of present sociological conditions and discussions.

The mysteries of suffering and sin find their solution likewise in the principle of the divine fatherhood. Not that we can explain everything now. To say with Buddhists and Stoics that evil, physical and moral, is inherent in existence, or with "Christian Scientists," that it is unreal, or with Calvinists that it is an arbitrary ordination of the absolute will of the Almighty Sovereign, would not now be satisfactory. But when we come to think of God as Father, though we may not be able to explain His reasons for everything that He does or permits in the world, we shall at least be persuaded that He has reasons, and that in the end all will be well. Meanwhile we can trust His fatherly love and infinite wisdom. The remaining subjects of the book before us are treated in the same spirit, and with equal penetration and genial discernment. Dr. Bradford is a theologian and preacher of a new type, one who has studied the old Gospel in the light of modern conditions, and is able, therefore, to bring a new message to our modern world, a message that can not fail to be helpful to thousands of people who have lost faith in the dogmas in which the Christian Gospel has so largely come to be encrusted. To preachers, especially, this new message, or rather this new interpretation of the old Gospel, should especially be welcome. They know how little force there is now in the old dogmas of foreordination, total depravity, bondage of the will, limited atonement, substitution, imputation, and others of similar character. These and similar dogmas can no longer be preached, however much of truth they may still be believed to contain. But the Gospel as interpreted by Dr. Bradford, and other thinkers of the same spirit, can be preached with effect and profit to the men of this generation. In the volume before us he touches on nearly all fundamental Christian doctrines, and on all the problems of our day, and shows how the former will meet and satisfy the latter. And this is done in a style that makes the book delightful reading. We are accustomed to think that all theological works must be

hard and heavy. Obscurity is taken for profundity; and the obscurity is frequently the result of an unwillingness to express clearly what is in men's minds. Dr. Bradford is always clear and forceful because he is always earnest and honest.

HULDREICH ZWINGLI; *the Reformer of German Switzerland, 1484–1531.* By Samuel Macauley Jackson, Professor of Church History, New York University. Together with an Historical Survey of Switzerland before the Reformation, by Prof. John Martin Vincent, Johns Hopkins University; and a Chapter on Zwingli Theology by Prof. Frank Hugh Foster, University of California. Pages, xxvi + 519. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York and London, 1901. Price, $2.00.

This is the fifth volume of the *Heroes of the Reformation* series, in course of publication by the firm of G. P. Putnam's Sons. The volumes previously published are entitled respectively, *Martin Luther; Philip Melanchthon; Desiderius Erasmus;* and *Theodore Beza.* Those yet to follow will be on *John Calvin*, *John Knox*, and *Thomas Cranmer.* The whole series is published under the general editorship of Professor Jackson, the author of the present volume. Some of the distinctive features of this series are that full use is made of the original correspondence of their respective subjects, and that comprehensive literary and historical references and adequate indexes are given in each volume. The series, it is said in the general prospectus, "is so planned that the narratives shall be not mere eulogies, but critical biographies; and the defects of judgment or sins of omission or commission on the parts of the subjects will not be passed by or extenuated. On the other hand they will do full justice to the nobility of character and to the distinctive contribution made by each one of these great Protestant leaders of the Reformation period. The series will avoid the partisanship of writers like Merle d'Aubigné, and, in the opposite direction, of the group of which Johannes Janssen may be taken as a type." This plan seems to be well adhered to in the volumes which have thus far made their appearance; and, instead of ideal pictures, we have true and faithful photographs of the men through whose instrumentality the Reformation was accomplished. These men are, indeed, worthy of all honor, as brave and honest servants of God and His church; but they are men of flesh and blood like ourselves, and affected with the same infirmities and passions.

Of the subject of the volume before us the author uses the following language in the preface: "The four years of intimate association with Zwingli which the author has enjoyed (by means of his letters and books) have greatly increased his respect for the man. But though Zwingli has won his high regard, he is unable, through his own inability, perhaps, to appreciate greatness, to value him so highly as some do. He does not put him in the front rank of the great men of the world, nor in Reformation history on equality with Luther and Calvin. His defects are patent; his literary work is so refquently marred by haste that

while it served its immediate ends well it has less interest for the after world * * * his jealousy of Luther was a mark of weakness; in the latter part of his life he was more a politician than he should have been." In this connection we may state also that in the body of the work under notice the author frankly acknowledges that in a moral respect Zwingli was not perfect. In his early life his relations with the female sex were not free from blame; and even while at Zurich playing the rôle of Reformer, he lived in concubinage for two years with the widow Anna Reinhard whom afterwards, in 1524, he made his lawful wife. These things must, of course, not be judged in the same light in which such conduct would be judged now. No man ever succeeds in living entirely above the plane of his moral environment; and Zwingli's moral and ecclesiastical environment was thoroughly bad. How corrupt the ordinary priests of that time were, how largely they were devoted to wine and women, is shown by contemporary documents of Catholic ecclesiastics of high station quoted in this volume. To the reproach of unchastity now sometimes uttered against Zwingli by Roman Catholics, the reply may be made that the majority of ecclesiastics of his time were unchaste, and that nobody thought much of it. The Catholic Church had failed to inculcate and enforce the law of chastity. Had Zwingli been no heretic he might have lived in concubinage to the end of his life, as the majority of priests did, without incurring any censure of the Church.

But while Professor Jackson is not blind to the faults of his hero, neither is he blind to the virtues for which he was distinguished. On the contrary he thoroughly appreciates them, and expresses his admiration of the man in the following language: "He was a generous, self-sacrificing, lovable character, whose politico-religious writings reveal the stalwart Swiss who could not be bribed to silence, the man who saw clearly the cause of his country's decline, but who loved his country in spite of all her faults with a passionate devotion, and for her sake laid down his life. It is as a man, as an indefatigable worker, as a broad-minded scholar, as an approved player of a large part on a small stage, that the author admires Zwingli and commends him to others. Whether he was right in his theology the author does not here discuss; nor is he at all concerned to expound and defend his distinctive teachings. But he believes that if the four great continental reformers—Luther, Melanchthon, Zwingli, and Calvin—should appear to-day, the one among them who would have to do least to adapt himself to our modern ways of thought, and the man who would soonest gather an enthusiastic following, would be Huldreich Zwingli, the reformer of German Switzerland." In this last judgment we believe that Professor Jackson is entirely right. In many respects Calvin's theology like the theology of the other reformers, was simply the theology of the time. A simple perusal of Dr. Foster's sketch in this volume

will convince one of the truth of this proposition. For instance, he agreed with the other reformers on the subject of predestination, divine sovereignty, and atonement. But there are a number of points also in regard to which he was in advance of his time. For instance, on the subject of original sin he held that the sin derived from Adam is only improperly called sin. It is of the nature of *disease* rather than sin, and involves no guilt. He also expressed his conviction of the salvation of all infants, and of some heathen. These are points in which he would now meet with the most advanced theology of the present age.

But a few words more as to the composition of the book under consideration. The first forty-seven pages are devoted to an historical survey of Switzerland at the beginning of the sixteenth century. This gives us a comprehensive view of the political, social, moral, intellectual and religious condition of the Swiss people in the time just preceding the Reformation. The following sentence written in 1504 by the Milanese ambassador, Balcus, will show the opinion which foreigners entertained of the Swiss people: "Although the Swiss are altogether unhewn barbarians, yet they live among themselves according to certain laws which they consider so holy that no one dares to break or overstep them, because it is a crime to have broken them even in the slightest." The history of Zwingli's life, from the time of his birth on the 1st of January, 1484, to the day of his death, October 11, 1531, forms the bulk of this book, extending from pages 49 to 362. It would be impossible to refer to particulars in this narrative of the Reformer's life; nor is this necessary, for the leading events are pretty well known. It should be mentioned, however, that this history is based throughout upon contemporaneous documents, and that the author's judgment sometimes varies from that of other historians. In short this is a *critical history* of the Reformer's life rather than a dogmatic one; and its aim is to give the reader a *true* rather than a *confessional* knowledge of the subject with which it deals. The result, however, will be a more rational and a firmer conviction of the legitimacy and necessity of the Reformation, than many readers may have entertained before. In the presence of such criticism, though it may take away some of the halo with which partisans have invested its subject, Romanism and Romanists will appeal in vain to the idea of an "infallible church" and a "supernatural priesthood." If history shows that the Reformer was but human, it also shows that his opponents were but human and that the cause which they represented was not the cause of true religion and of humanity.

The supplementary chapter on Zwingli's theology, philosophy, and ethics has already been referred to, but no particular account of it can here be given. Suffice it to say that in the space of 38 pages we have a complete and thoroughly intelligible résumé of the Reformer's theological and philosophical principles in their connection. No better study of Zwingli's theology could be de-

sired. We have yet to add that the value of the volume before us is enhanced by the presence of numerous illustrations, facsimiles of letters and other documents, various maps, and complete lists of literature. Mechanically the book is gotten up in the best style of the printer's and binder's art, and the reader will find it to be a pleasure to the eye as well as to the mind.

ISRAEL'S MESSIANIC HOPE TO THE TIME OF JESUS CHRIST. By George Stephen Goodspeed, Professor in the University of Chicago. Page, x + 315. New York. The Macmillan Company, 1900.

The subject of this excellent book is one of vital importance, as well as of deep interest. Of all nations Israel was the most optimistic. It was the nation of hope. Its eye was always fixed on the future, and cherishing an abiding faith in Jahveh, the God of righteousness, it felt the blessed certainty that its lofty ethical ideals would in due time be fully realized. And they were. The Messianic hope reaches its perfect fruition in Jesus Christ, "the unifying element in the Old and New Testaments." As nature attains its true goal and highest meaning in man, towards whom its inmost life was ever struggling from the beginning, so "the history of Israel culminates in Jesus Christ. This is true in the sense, not merely that he is the last and greatest figure of Israel's history, but also that all the history was making toward him, preparing for him, revealing elements ideas and forces which united and came to their fulness in him." To trace out in this history the unfolding of the Messianic hope in all its stages from lower to higher, from national to ethical forms is the aim of the author, who in the subtitle designates his book a study in the historical development of the foreshadowings of the Christ in the Old Testament and beyond.

The author's conception of Messianic prophecy is very broad, and includes much that to many might seem to have no connection with such prophecy. Messianic prophecy has often been thought of as if God raised up and inspired a long line of seers, who from the beginning and throughout the successive ages, fixed their steady gaze directly on a distant person, Jesus Christ, describing more or less clearly the main outlines of His person and work, or pointing out those events and institutions of the history of Israel which served as types foreshadowing him. The view set forth in this book has a much wider scope and unlike the mechanical, we might almost say magical, notion still current in the popular mind, includes whatever in the life and thought of Israel was concerned with a brighter future—the ideals sketched by prophetic minds and the hopes cherished by pious hearts. Indeed the whole Old Testament is in this view Messianic, as far as it gradually prepares the way for the New Testament Messiah. Each age makes its contribution to Messianic thought, enlarges and spiritualizes the Messianic hope and advances the national life to a higher plane. No institution, no personality, no event, no ideal, no aspiration is without significance.

Such is the point of view from which the author surveys the development of the Messianic hope. Accordingly he does not confine himself to isolated portions of the prophetical literature of the Old Testament, supposed to contain direct predictions of a personal Messiah. But taking up Genesis, for example, he directs attention first, not, as we might expect, to the *protevangelium*, but to the ideals of humanity, the nature and destiny of man (Gen. 1 : 26–28), by which the purpose and the progress of salvation are made possible. Only then does he pass to the hope of victory over sin, or to the ideal of ultimate deliverance (Gen. 3 : 14, 15); to the hope of comfort, or the ideal of civilization (Gen. 5 : 28); to the hope of Jehovah's indwelling in Shem, or the ideal of religion (Gen. 9 : 25–27); to the hope of the national home and glory, or the ideal of nationality (Gen. 12 : 1–3; 13 : 14–17; 15 : 1–7; 27 : 27–29); and, finally, to the hope of a coming victorious ruler or the ideal of kingship (Gen. 49 : 8–12). He does not limit himself even to the canonical books of the Old Testament, but traces the Messianic hope through the Apocryphal and Apocalyptic literature, which exerted so great an influence on the thought and expression of the New Testament writers.

It is evident from what has been said that the author adopts the historical method of investigation, whose endeavor is, not "to discover how much more the Old Testament means when it is viewed in the light of the life, teachings and work of Jesus Christ," nor yet "to determine the ultimate and essential truth which these Old Testament statements contain," but which simply asks, "Not so much, What does this statement mean to the Christian Church? but what did it mean to him who first uttered it, and to those by whom it was first heard or read?"

The plan of the book is admirable. It exhibits the various forms of the Messianic hope assumed in (1) The Pre-Mosaic Age; (2) The Mosaic Age; (3) The United Kingdom; (4) Times of the Earlier Prophets; (5) Times of Isaiah; (6) Times of Jeremiah; (7) The Exile; (8) The Post-Exilic Period to the Maccabean Uprising; (9) From the Maccabees to Jesus; and then, in a final chapter, portrays the Messianic Ideal as a whole, and shows how it was realized in Jesus Christ. Taking up these ages in succession, the author first characterizes the literature from which he derives his material. For the Pre-Mosaic Age he is exclusively dependent on the book of Genesis, which he, with all modern critics, holds to be a compilation of two prophetic documents, J. and E., and a priestly document, P., whose probable dates and relations he states. This critical part is always brief, but sufficiently full for the circle of readers he has in view. Then follows an historical picture, always skillfully drawn, of the period which gave birth to the new ideals and hopes. A few strokes of the pen by a masterly hand sets before the reader the prominent features and significance of the several ages. The various passages in which the Messianic hope finds expression are then

briefly discussed and their meaning clearly brought to view. Finally there is a summing up of the nature and extent of the "preparation" each several period illustrates. At the close of every chapter "topics for further study" are suggested with the literature bearing on them.

The book is intended, as the author says, for the intelligent reader of the English Bible. It is popular in the best sense of the word; yet as it is strictly scientific, giving the best results of modern Biblical study, it may be read with profit as well as with interest by all classes alike.

F. A. G.

THE BIBLICAL THEOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. By Ezra P. Gould, D.D. ("New Testament Handbooks," edited by Shailer Matthews.) Pages, 217. New York, The Macmillan Co., 1900. Price, $0.75.

Biblical scholars have awaited with eagerness the appearance of this little volume. And this for two reasons. First, because of the high value and increasing favor of the comparatively new science of Biblical Theology. Second, because of the reputation of the author for vigorous thoughtfulness and open-minded, devout scholarship. Dr. Gould's commentary on Mark, in the series of international critical commentaries, has already won a place second to none in the literature on the second Gospel.

This last product of his mind and heart does not fall below the high standard of his former great work. It is a "last product" in a pathetic sense. The shadow of death was upon him before the work was completed. Every line of the book is accented with the conviction of one who seems to be conscious of writing a final message, with the "confidence that it may enable students to find their way through the New Testament." In the words quoted he concludes the Preface.

Dr. Gould's handbook is the highest type of a handbook. It is not, like many others, a compilation, presenting in brief form the labors of other scholars, or perhaps the best thoughts of other minds. Dr. Gould could not be a compiler. He is an author. The seal of his authorship appears on every line. He goes over the same ground that has been traversed by many others but he makes his own path. Not that he is willful or unappreciative of other men's labors, but he is too honest a student to accept the results of others' labors. He quotes no man's opinions; nor does he enter into controversy. Through many years of patient, painstaking study and research he works his way through the New Testament, and then gives his interpretation of its theology. His method is scientific, critical, constructive. In his quest for the truth he does not concern himself about the assumptions and opinions of either the traditionalists or of the critics. While many of the problems with which the author deals belong largely to the province of criticism, a field of many open questions, yet he speaks with no wavering tone. His positiveness and assurance

are proof of his earnestness and strong personal conviction and do not indicate a spirit of dogmatism. Dr. Gould writes as one fully persuaded in his own mind, with the authority of a teacher who has proved his right to be heard. The style of the little volume is compact, but very clear. There is no dull page in the book. The author's keen and profound interest is maintained throughout the twenty-four chapters—notwithstanding the difficult and complex character of many of the subjects discussed.

Dr. Gould's scheme is clearly outlined in the introductory chapter which contains the pre-suppositions of the theology of the New Testament. The New Testament literature presents a series of contrasts similar to those which appear in the preceding Jewish literature.

These contrasts are made a basis for the author's division of the New Testament books into different classes, and at the same time differentiate the values of the several writings.

These contrasts are: 1. The antagonism of priest and prophet. 2. The antagonism of prophet and scribe. 3. The contrast of prophet and philosopher. The prophet holds the preëminent place. "The note of inspiration, with its accompaniment of authority, belongs only to the prophetic side of scripture." Jesus takes his place by the side of the prophets, and His teaching, therefore, ranks in authority above all others. For this reason the synoptics are authoritative above all other New Testament writings.

St. Paul in his doctrine, represents both priestism and prophetism, "a mixture which we do not find in the synoptics." He also shows the contrast of prophet and philosopher. At times he deals with that side of divine or human being that eventuates in conduct. At other times he attempts to "rationalize tremendous spiritual facts." "In the one case only," says Dr. Gould, "does he speak with authority; in the other, he interests me greatly."

Jesus confines himself in his teaching to the prophetic mode. The noticeable thing about Jesus' doctrine of God is the absence of everything touching the mode of the Divine Being, and the concentration upon his ethical qualities. There is in his teaching little or no contribution to the philosophy of the Divine Being" (page 14). This is characteristic of the teaching of Jesus throughout.

Included in the Teaching of Jesus are the following subjects: the idea of God and the kingdom of God, Jesus' estimate of Himself, His conception of man, and His doctrine of last things. Then follow the earlier teachings of the twelve; the teaching of Paul on sin and the law, the righteousness of faith, the Holy Spirit, the completion of salvation, and the person of Christ, the later apostolic teaching, expressed partly in the synoptics but mainly in the writings of James and of Peter, and the extreme anti-Paulinism of the Apocalypse, and lastly the theology of the Alexandrian group of writings in which the author includes Ephesians, Colos-

sians, 1st and 2d Timothy, Titus, Hebrews, 2d Peter, Jude, and the Johannean writings.

It will be seen from the foregoing outline and classification that Dr. Gould is as familiar with the science of New Testament Introduction as with that of New Testament Theology. And he is as free and fearless in the one department as in the other.

It is probable that the critics as well as the general reader will often dissent from the views of the author. And they may have just ground for dissent. But the book is no less valuable because of the fact that many of the author's opinions are unconvincing, and, in some instances, startling. The thoughtfulness of the book is such as stimulates thought. In this consists its main value. It compels the reader to reëxamine the grounds of his own opinions and beliefs, resulting in many instances in modification and reconstruction. All prejudice aside, it cannot fail to prove helpful in the study of the New Testament Scriptures. More than that need not be said in commending it to the Bible student.

J. C. B.

REASONS FOR FAITH IN CHRISTIANITY, WITH ANSWERS TO HYPERCRITICISM. By John McDowell Leavitt, D.D., LL.D. Pages, 240. Price, $1.25. Eaton & Mains, New York, 1900.

If the second clause in the above title stood first, the title would more clearly indicate the purpose of this book. Ostensibly the author desires to present an apology for Christianity in the light of modern science; yet the work contains so many "answers to hypercriticism" that the reader can not help but feel that this is the real purpose of the book. Plainly the author is a representative of the "old school," and has very little sympathy for the results of modern scholarship. "Higher criticism" has no other effect upon him than to throw him into intense excitement. Dr. Briggs especially excites his ire. In the very first chapter of the book, the author "approaches with pain the critical infirmities of Dr. Briggs," and then charges that he "exalts himself, abuses his enemies, and exaggerates his office." The author adds, "He [Dr. Briggs] says, 'It may be regarded as a certain result of Higher Criticism that Moses did not write the Pentateuch.' Observe! For this immense destructive conclusion, no argument! the magic word 'scholarship' entombs Moses, obliterates Joshua, extinguishes Jonah, pulverizes David, bisects Isaiah, nullifies Daniel, discredits Christ, clouds His apostles, sweeps away Rabbins, overthrows Jewish national belief, contradicts the Greek and Latin and Anglican communions, and repudiates the profoundest learning of English and American Protestantism." In another place the author exclaims, "Moses a forgery! Yet Jesus Christ fulfilled this forgery, quoted this forgery, imposed this forgery as a condition of faith in Himself!" These are fair samples of the way the author inveighs against "higher criticism"; and they do not serve to raise one's confidence in his fairness and ability.

The fact is, it is hard to tell just what the author means by "hypercriticism." He calls it "probability," yet treats it as though it were Infidelity. Briggs, and Voltaire, and Ingersoll are all placed in the same class. He sees no difference between an avowed infidel and a "higher critic." Whoever denies the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, or the Pauline authorship of Hebrews is to him an enemy of the church and Christianity. He knows no evolution but atheistic evolution, and therefore he assails the evolutionists. He says, "the second chapter of Genesis seems an historical revelation. If a myth, the Bible is a myth." Note! If one single chapter is a myth, the whole Bible is a myth! The author plainly possesses more bitterness against higher criticism than he does sound judgment. His "answers" are no answers, only weak and futile attempts.

In the development of the reasons for faith in Christianity, the author meets with better success. Indeed, for this reason the book is worthy of a careful perusal. There are seventeen chapters in which the various arguments are set forth. Some of the arguments worthy of notice are those from unity and personality, archæological proofs, adaptation of Christianity, prophecy, and the resurrection. The style is clear and terse, with a strong tendency towards the epigrammatic. The print is large and clear, and the whole book is a model of the publisher's art.

H. H. R.

THE DOMESTIC LIFE AND CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PENNSYLVANIA-GERMAN PIONEER. By Rev. F. J. F. Schantz, D.D., Pastor of Friedens Lutheran Church, Myerstown, Pa. The New Era Printing Co., Lancaster, Pa.

The author of this book is one of the few living authorities on the subject about which he writes. He is a typical product of the Pennsylvania-German stock. He has spent his life among his own people. As a pastor, known throughout this State, he has had exceptional opportunities to become acquainted with the various phases of Pennsylvania life and the antiquities of the pioneers. For the last thirty years his services have been in demand at centennials, semi- and sesqui-centennials of congregations, for delivering the historical address. He has published the history of a number of congregations in eastern Pennsylvania in pamphlet form.

He has now given his readers, in artistic form and in readable style, the fruit of his researches into the early life of the Germans in Pennsylvania. The twelve chapters, beside a preface and an appendix, contain the following topics: Prefatory, Primitive Condition of Pennsylvania before the earlier settlers arrived; The Founding of a Home; Domestic Economy; Cultivating the Soil; Wearing Apparel of German Settlers; The Barnyard and Its Denizens; Domestic Piety and Religion; Care of Children; Servants; The Aged and Infirm; Hospitality; Special Occasions; Characteristics of the Pennsylvania-German Pioneers; Appendix, Christopher Dock's Rules for Children. A series of 12 plates and

34 illustrations throw light on the text and are not the least valuable part of the work for presenting to the eye of the future generations the implements used in the house, barn, and on the field by our pioneers. What we have found in the garret or cellar, or perhaps as ornamental antiquities in the sitting-room and around the modern mantle, was then a necessary part of daily life. The tallow-dip, the tongs, the tripod, the twisting wheel, the spinning wheel, etc., have been put into permanent form in the illustrations of this book and will be examined much more closely fifty years hence.

The chapter on the domestic piety of the pioneers is an excellent and fair description of the religious life of our ancestors. They were not all saints, but by no means were they all sinners. It is not difficult to see how the English settlers would underrate the German type of piety and spread false reports about the illiterate and irreligous German in Pennsylvania. They cannot appreciate German piety to this day. It is too quiet and mystical for them. The German knew his Bible, his Starke's Gebetbuch, his Arndt's Wahres Christenthum. He encouraged the printing press, and the school. The list of publications from the German press in Pennsylvania, in the eighteenth century, should be examined by every layman and preacher. In the last chapters we have a true picture of the social life of the people, as it appeared in the wedding, the funeral, in parties, bees, vendues, movings, corn-huskings, barn-raisings, family reunions. While the German naturally differed from his English, Scotch and French neighbors, he was as earnest, faithful, and devout a parent, neighbor, citizen, churchman as any of his fellow settlers in the new world.

This work should be found in the library of every Pennsylvania-German family. It should be read by the rising generation; it will be a delight to the passing generation. It is a prose counterpart from the Lutheran church to the classic presentation of Pennsylvania-German life in the poetic productions of Dr. Harbaugh of the Reformed Church. It is only through the older men of the present, who are a connecting link between the pioneers and the new order of life of the twentieth century, that we can get a true picture of the past and preserve many facts and phases of life from oblivion. G. W. R.